THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1934. Vol. XXIV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Liverpool Cathedral Case concluded.

With the decision of the Upper House of Convocation of York the Liverpool Cathedral case did not close. On the day following that decision the Bishop of Liverpool published a notable pamphlet bearing on it, entitled *Who are Christians?* on which we comment in an article in this issue.

On June 9th, Dean Dwelly and Professor Raven sent a letter to Dr. L. P. Jacks apologizing to him for what had happened. This letter, together with Dr. Jacks' reply, was read out from the pulpit at the non-statutory service in Liverpool Cathedral on the following Sunday evening.[1] As the correspondence occupies some twenty-nine printed pages we only here cite that portion of it which seeks to justify the sending of the invitation to Dr. Jacks to preach in the Cathedral. The Dean and Professor write :

> In expressing to you our regret for what has taken place, may we take the opportunity to state what have been the ideals and principles on which we of the Liverpool Cathedral have been acting? We do so in order to answer once for all the charge that the invitation to you was an act of sudden and ill-considered impulse, a deliberate attempt to provoke excitement, or a dramatic and shocking innovation.
>
> At the time of its consecration the most representative leaders of the Church of England united to assure us that a great opportunity lay before us and a great responsibility upon us, that the Cathedral built with the goodwill of a modern industrial city must strive to rise

[1] Published by the Oxford University Press. Price 1/-.

above narrow and sectional interests, and that in a day of fresh beginnings our loyalty to the Anglican Communion should express itself in a reverent and courageous adventuring. Not less plainly was this advice emphasized by both the present Archbishops at the Church Congress held three years after the consecration in our own diocese. By that time the general policy and programme of our Cathedral had been settled. Our Special Services and our invitations to preachers of other denominations were a matter of common knowledge. Our doctrinal position was fully explained at the Congress by our Bishop and by members of our Chapter. Yet, far from receiving any censure from our distinguished visitors, we were not only commended for what we had done, but exhorted to further experiments. Dr. Temple, then Bishop of Manchester, in a speech published in the Report of the Congress, claimed that fellowship such as was manifested not only in interdenominational activities like C.O.P.E.C. but in the Labour Party or the W.E.A. was a consequence and a proof of the activity of the Divine Spirit; that we as Churchmen must recognize and accept it as such, must enter into cordial relations with all who displayed it, must refuse to exploit them or to condemn them if their experience was not identical with our own. His speech was typical of the general sentiment of the Congress, and is a curious comment on his recent attitude.

It is unnecessary to describe the character of our Cathedral's ideal and activities as this was shaped in the first decade of its life. One of us has already done this in an 'Impression,' published last year. This shows that the action for which we have now been attacked was consistent with our whole outlook, that this outlook was clear, coherent, and based upon long and careful deliberation, and that we cannot agree to any restriction of our liberty without being false to our principles and blind to the teaching of experience.

Two points may, perhaps, be added. The invitation to you was not an innovation. On the occasion of the Centenary of the British Association, General Smuts, who like yourself is free from any credal or denominational allegiance, gave an address at the same service as that at which you spoke. The vast congregation heard then, as it heard from you, words of mature and profoundly moving wisdom, words which were a true 'Prophesying.' On the same occasion in our prayers we gave thanks by name for the work of Charles Darwin and many others who can only be called Christians if Justin Martyr was right in bestowing the name of Christian upon Heracleitus and Socrates and those whose lives were lived 'in accordance with the Divine Word.' For this which was surely a more serious break with tradition than our present action we received not a word of criticism; indeed we were both privately and publicly encouraged by the same authorities who have now been sitting in judgment on us.

Further, the whole character of the service at which you preached had been designed for such an opportunity. The Cathedral naturally has its regular and ordered offices of Morning and Evening Prayer as these are laid down in the Prayer Book and the Canons. At the time of its consecration the Bishop and the Chapter felt that there was room for something more — that in these days and in a great city there were very many who would be helped by a less formal act of worship. A time was chosen which could not draw anyone away from the services in parish churches; the teaching was concerned only with the fundamentals of religion. We hoped to bring into an experience of Christian fellowship some of those who were outside all 'Church' connexions

and who were not ready or not able to appreciate the traditional usage. We decided from the first that for such a service we should try to obtain the help of men and women outside the ranks of Anglican clergy; for we believed that by so doing we should gain a great enrichment for our congregation and also testify to the unity underlying our present and largely out-of-date divisions.

The experience of the past ten years has entirely confirmed our expectations. The service has grown steadily. Without any sort of special inducements to join, the fellowship of its congregation now numbers many thousands, and members of it are to be found all over the world, and are known by the name of Commoners of Liverpool Cathedral. It has led very many to a new understanding of Christianity, to a change of outlook and life, and to very various kinds of Christian service. Many have gone on to close association with their parish churches or with other places of worship; several have offered themselves for ordination; others, and in large numbers, have volunteered for social work, for the care of the sick and the distressed, for classes and lectures. We believe that the service has had a profound influence not only upon individuals but upon the community, not only upon the churches but upon the Cathedral.

It has stood for the belief that 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are the Sons of God,' that the test of fruits is the only one sanctioned by Christ, and that in these days the close co-operation of all Christian people was a matter of primary concern. If its appeal has been limited, that is due partly to the insufficiency of us who have been chiefly responsible for it, and partly to the restrictions imposed upon us by authority. But at least it has given to us all a new vision of what the Church might be, a unique experience of communion in worship, and a deeper and richer knowledge of God in Christ. We are sure that to abandon it or to change its character would be for us an act of open apostasy.

For indeed it would be easy to collect from the published utterances of almost every authority in all the churches evidence of the need for such developments as we have tried to foster. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 with its appeal to those outside the churches to reconsider the claims of religion and to those within them to labour boldly for reunion; the Lambeth Conference of 1930 with its fresh and generous presentation of the faith in terms appropriate to the thought of to-day; the Archbishops' Pastoral Letter calling clergy and people to realize the changes in intellectual outlook and to seek for fresh understanding of God's nature and will; the admissions of the failure of traditional methods, the exhortations to adventurous thought and action, the authorizing of experiments, the insistence upon evangelism; these are either insincere or they should bespeak for us the sympathy of their authors. It surely cannot be consistent at once to lament the large numbers who are living without any sort of religious observance and to condemn or hamper an effort which has proved by ten years' experience to be effective in arousing them to a knowledge of God. It surely cannot be just to encourage us to make our Cathedral the mother-church of the community and then to treat us as guilty of disobedience when we try to realize that ideal.

Moreover, with reference to your own visit, though we acknowledge that for many of our clergy and people the name Unitarian arouses strong emotion as seeming to imply the denial of the divine authority of Christ, we know from a vast mass of evidence, oral and written,

that to multitudes of Christians the event seemed natural, satisfying, and prophetic. They feel that, in face alike of the changes in thought and of the widespread rejection of all religious faith, the maintenance of the old exclusiveness between followers of Christ is both false and foolish; that while not disputing the value of theological doctrines or of formulated beliefs we do well to rejoice in the united assertion of those essentials which all Christians hold in common; that such unity as your presence with us attested is the necessary preliminary to any true progress; and that you have helped us to escape from an unreal absorption in issues which are largely irrelevant and wholly secondary. In these days when the future of civilization is obscure, when man's confidence in the security of his conventional standards is crumbling, when crude superstitions have been revived and Christian faith and ethics are being challenged, those of us who stand for the religious interpretation of life, those of us who draw inspiration from the Gospel of Jesus, should surely declare our unity. To quibble about ancient formularies, to appeal to outworn precedents, to refuse all movement as dangerous and all change as disloyal is to deny the faith, to betray the cause, to reject the opportunity.

The policy of the Liverpool Cathedral may have been right or it may have been wrong, but it is perfectly clear from this defence that the invitation to Dr. Jacks was in harmony with that policy and that that policy had received general commendation from the Episcopate. With the recent episcopal condemnation of that invitation the policy stands condemned and the freedom of the cathedral pulpit is thereby seriously circumscribed.

We really doubt whether the bishops as a whole could have desired to do this, but Lord Hugh Cecil's action forced them into a position in which they felt they had no alternative. It was the lay, not the clerical, vote which deprived Frederick Denison Maurice of his professorship at King's College, London, and we see in Lord Hugh Cecil's triumph the dangers which threaten a church in which the ecclesiastical layman directs the policy.

Two more letters in the Liverpool Case.

Press comment on the Liverpool Cathedral case have been varied. Any summary of it would be impossible. There are, however, two letters written by members of the Modern Churchmen's Union which seem to us to go so much to the heart of the matter that we venture to republish them here.

The first is from the Rev. Canon Harold Anson and appeared in the *Guardian* of June 2nd, 1934.

'I feel that your article of warm approbation of the decision of the bishops of the northern Convocation in the recent Liverpool contro-

versy ought not to pass without a word of dissent from those who, like myself, are profoundly discouraged and wounded by it.

'It is doubtless true, as you say, that there was no trial of Dr. David; but it is no less true that the resolutions were a direct and unanimous vote of censure on his action. And it is not his one action in the case of Dr. Jacks which is really involved, but the whole spirit and understanding of Christ's teaching for which Liverpool Cathedral and St. Martin-in-the-Fields stand (and at St. Martin's Dr. Jacks has been a welcome and most honoured teacher) which is really felt to be condemned. We all know that if Dr. David had encouraged medieval teaching, of however extreme a type, he would never have been condemned at all.

'To one like myself, whose ministry must of necessity be soon ended, the problem cannot be a serious personal one. But for others, as I have found out during these last weeks, the discouragement and sense of hopelessness about the future of the Church which this totally unexpected blow, coming from those from whom we should least have expected it, has caused, is much more serious. Lay people who feel that a censure on Dr. David is a censure upon them will withdraw quietly from active co-operation in the Church's work; men thinking of being ordained will look for other work; and the clergy affected will, no doubt, as you desire, act "in humble obedience to the bishop" and refrain from asking any Christian, however eminent, to speak to them in church who does not hold with the Nicene Creed. But many will feel that this is the most bitter disillusion that they could have suffered as to the whole spirit which animates our rulers. If they suffer in silence they have a right, I think, to make it known that they are whole-heartedly behind the Bishop of Liverpool in his interpretation of our Lord's spirit towards those who do His work and yet cannot explain His Person as others think they have succeeded in doing.'

The second letter is from Miss Irene Hubbard and was published in the *Inquirer* of June 30th, 1934.

'It has been my privilege to have had a fairly close acquaintance with Anglican Liberalism and I have for some time past attended services and gatherings at Manchester College, Oxford. So far from gaining the impression that Liberalism is moving away from the spirit and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, it has seemed to me to be a consecration to that spirit and a very definite attempt to apply that teaching not only to personal, but to social and international life. It was not until I came in contact with Liberal Christianity that I found organized religion attempting to make the ethic of Jesus a definite influence in practical affairs. Only in Liberal Christianity have I found the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus made a reality, since it is only what we instinctively respond to as the highest we know and take as our guide in the difficult ways of life, that we may be said to worship as Divine. It seems to me that those who take the Prophet of Nazareth as their guide because in His teaching they have found the highest values they know, do truly acknowledge His Divinity—far more truly that those who, while subscribing to the creeds, make religion a mere cult and never attempt to apply the teaching of Jesus to practical affairs.

'Judge, therefore, of my surprise on reading such statements as these in *The Inquirer*: "Jesus was, it is admitted, a child of His

time." "Can it [Liberal Christianity] accept the dogmas and at the same time proclaim a morality opposed at least to the literal interpretation of the Gospels."

'In reply to this I affirm that no genius is a child of his time. His genius lies in the fact that he speaks the language of eternity. And to speak of Liberal Christianity as accepting traditional dogma is to betray lack of acquaintance with facts. I maintain that Liberal Christianity, while denying the traditional interpretation of such dogmas as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection of the Body, Eternal Punishment and the Apostolic Succession, does definitely teach the great underlying assumptions of the religion of Jesus, namely, the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the supreme importance of the indwelling spirit of righteousness as against a mechanical observance of the letter of the law, and the duty of absolute and unconditional forgiveness of injuries. I do not know how this is to "proclaim a morality opposed at least to the literal interpretation of the Gospels."

'In conclusion let me say that, although an Anglican, and deeply attached to the Liturgy of my own Church, I can see no essential difference between the spirit of Unitarianism and the spirit of Anglican Liberalism. Both appear to me to affirm the Divinity of Christ in the only form that has any value and the Liverpool Cathedral Controversy has seemed to me such a discussion of irrelevancies, as I could hardly have believed possible for intelligent Christian men. I think I am right in affirming that the vote of the Convocation of York will have caused all Anglican Liberals of goodwill considerable pain.'

We may be unduly optimistic, but we would point out to those who are depressed by the recent decisions of the Upper House of the Convocation of York that these letters are not only true to the genius of the Church of England but that they breathe the Spirit which will inspire it increasingly and which does inspire it even to-day, although in circles largely unrepresented in our ecclesiastical assemblies.

A Call to Home Reunion.

The following manifesto on Church Unity recently issued to the Free Churches of Great Britain and to the Church of Scotland by its signatories, which include seven bishops and many well-known members of the Liberal and Evangelical schools in the Church of England, deserves to be placed on record.

In view of the world's great need for unity, which we believe can be achieved lastingly only on a religious basis, and in face of the powerful disruptive forces in modern life, we affirm that there is no more urgent or inspiring task before the Churches of Christ than the promotion of Christian unity.

It is now nearly fourteen years since the issue of the Call to Unity in 1920, and we cannot feel satisfied with the progress which has been

made in that period towards a better understanding and closer co-operation between the Church of England and the Free Churches.

We therefore desire to assure the members of the Free Churches of Great Britain and the Church of Scotland that there is a large body of opinion in the Church of England which heartily and sincerely desires to press on towards what we believe is the high calling of God for this generation of Christians. To this end, and to remove as far as possible the misunderstandings and prejudices which hinder us from Godly union and concord, we make the following affirmations, in the confident belief that they are consistent with the official teaching and formularies of the Church of England, and that they represent the views of the majority of its members, and in the hope that they may form a sufficient and acceptable basis for mutual understanding and co-operation in promoting the Unity of the Church.

I.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CHURCH.

'We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His body.'

These words of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 were repeated, with solemn conviction, by the Conference of 1930. Further, the representatives of the Church of England on the Joint Conference at Lambeth, 1923, made the following statement:

'It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.'

These statements represent an advance towards Christian unity in which we rejoice and they appear to carry certain logical conclusions for which we are prepared to work with all our heart and power in the Church of England.

II.

HOLY COMMUNION.

It has already been pointed out by the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930 that a minister has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptised person kneeling before the Lord's Table unless he be excommunicated by name. We also hold the rubric which requires Confirmation to be a domestic rule of the Church of England, which does not exclude other baptised persons from occasional Communion, and it would, we believe, contribute to mutual understanding and sympathy if members of the Free Churches would realize that they would be welcome to the hospitality of the Lord's Table in a large number of our churches.

Further, in view of the acknowledgment referred to above, that Free Church Ministries are real Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments, we acknowledge that Divine Grace is imparted not only through the Sacraments of the Church of England but also through those of the Free Churches. We do not recognize the distinction sometimes drawn in this connection between 'covenanted' and 'free' Grace.

III.

INTERCHANGE OF PULPITS.

We desire to see greater use made of the approval given by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 to the occasional authorization of ministers not episcopally ordained, to preach in churches of the Church of England, and we emphatically dissociate ourselves from the protests which have been made when advantage has been taken of this approval.

With a view to the promotion of mutual understanding and fellowship between the churches we, on our part, would be grateful to receive as well as ready to give invitations.

IV.

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

In view of the misunderstanding which often arises as to what is implied by the episcopal system of the Church of England, and of the fact that acceptance of an episcopal ministry seems to some of our Free Church brethren a stumbling block in the way of unity, we would make the following declaration :

We accept Episcopacy as of the *Bene esse* and not as of the *esse* of the Church, and we do not regard acceptance of this method of Church Order as implying any particular theory or interpretation of it, or any view of its Dominical authority.

We make no exclusive claim for it as regards the Grace of God.

We hope that it may commend itself to the Free Churches as a method of Church Order of ancient tradition and historic value, and we believe that with the devising of constitutional safeguards and the organization of synodical institutions, in which the clergy and laity would play their due part, the system of Episcopacy is still the wisest and most efficient form of Church Order.

V.

THE ESTABLISHMENT.

We are aware that the relations between Church and State have contributed to the rise of the Free Churches, and that the Establishment of the Church is unwelcome to them. Without entering upon the advantages which appear to us to accrue to both Church and State from their mutual relationship, we consider that the situation would have different aspects in the event (for which we pray) of the Churches becoming more closely united. In such a case the whole question of the meaning and value of the Establishment would have to be reconsidered from both sides, and we believe that it would be possible to work out a *modus operandi* which would insure the liberty of the Church on the one hand and the official State recognition of Christianity on the other.

In conclusion we reiterate our belief that our divisions are a hindrance to the work of Christ's Kingdom and that no Christian should rest content with our present disunion, but that all should find in our common loyalty to our Lord and Master the summons to unremitting effort for promoting that understanding and fellowship which must be the basis of our growing unity. To this work we pledge ourselves and invite your co-operation.

C. A. ALINGTON (Dean of Durham), ARTHUR F. ALSTON (Archdeacon of Hastings), HAROLD ANSON (Vicar of Tandridge, Hon. Canon of Southwark), J. T. BARKING, J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER (Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge), J. S. BEZZANT (Canon of Liverpool), L. ELLIOTT BINNS (Rector of Great Hallingbury),

John D. Birchall, M.P. (Member of National Assembly), E. W. Birmingham, R. Blakeney (Canon of Peterborough), W. M. Browne (Archdeacon of Rochester), F. C. Burkitt (Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge), R. J. Campbell (Canon and Chancellor of Chichester), A. J. Carlyle (formerly Canon of Worcester), W. Wilson Cash (General Secretary, Church Missionary Society), Charnwood, C. M. Chavasse (Principal of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford), J. T. Christie (Headmaster of Repton School), Gilbert Coleridge, Edward S. Croydon, H. Montague Dale (Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels, Bournemouth), W. J. Havelock Davidson (Vicar of Bolton), Percy Dearmer (Canon of Westminster), W. Moore Ede (Dean of Worcester), Frank Fletcher (Headmaster of Charterhouse), J. Paul S. R. Gibson (Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge), J. Battersby Harford (Canon of Ripon), G. H. Harris (Principal of King William's College, Isle of Man), H. St. B. Holland (Archdeacon of Warwick), R. T. Howard (Provost of Coventry), J. W. Hunkin (Archdeacon of Coventry), W. R. Inge (Dean of St. Paul's), Thomas W. H. Inskip (Member of National Assembly), Hewlett Johnson (Dean of Canterbury), W. Guy Johnson (Member of National Assembly), Cyril Leicester, W. W. Longford (Rector of Sefton, Liverpool), W. H. MacKean (Canon of Rochester), H. D. A. Major (Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford), W. R. Matthews (Dean of Exeter), Cecil Middleton, W. D. Morrison (Rector of Marylebone), W. E. R. Morrow (Provost of Chelmsford), Cyril Norwood (Headmaster of Harrow), A. G. Pite (Headmaster of Weymouth College), C. E. Raven (Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge), J. H. Richards (Archdeacon of Aston), R. D. Richardson (Vicar of Four Oaks, Warwickshire), M. R. Ridley (Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford), Arthur Ripon, T. Guy Rogers (Rector and Hon. Canon of Birmingham), W. Stanton Sodor and Man, Vernon F. Storr (Archdeacon of Westminster), B. H. Streeter (Provost of Queen's College, Oxford), Norman Sykes (Professor of History in the University of London), A. J. Tait (Canon of Peterborough), J. R. S. Taylor (Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford), G. C. Turner (Headmaster of Marlborough College), C. S. Wallis (Principal of St. John's College, Durham), J. R. C. Webb (Principal of Bishop Wilson Theological College), J. E. C. Welldon (formerly Dean of Durham), Douglas White, H. Costley White (Headmaster of Westminster School), A. T. P. Williams (Headmaster of Winchester College), F. Garfield H. Williams (Dean of Manchester), Arnold T. Wilson, M.P., T. J. Wood (Vicar of St. John's, Clapham).

The manifesto contains nothing new, but we hope it may serve as a timely reminder that although there be some in the Church of England who are mainly concerned to secure closer relations with Christians abroad, there are also those who are deeply concerned to secure closer relations with Christians at home. The *Times*, whose growing sympathy with Anglo-Catholicism has reduced the weight of its comments on Church issues,

expresses the view that the influence of this manifesto 'upon the unity of the Church of England itself must be deplorable,' and resents the publication because it will give offence to many English Churchmen who do not agree with it. The *Times* leader remarks:

> 'To aim at greater unity with neighbours across the road may be laudable enough. But the duty of showing charity and consideration to their own brethren in their own house seems even more important.'

It seems to us that to refuse to be on good terms with one's neighbour across the street because one desires to be on good terms with some people living in the next county, more truly expresses the real situation. Our good relations with the orthodox Eastern Churches must be purchased at too high a price if that price be the failure to secure union with our fellow-Christians at home.

Better relations with Roman Catholics will be neither improved nor retarded by the promotion of Unity with the Free Churches. The Anglo-Catholic members of the Church of England who resent these efforts to promote closer relations with Free Churchmen constitute less than 5 per cent. of our British population, and although we do not desire to give them pain yet we cannot regard it as right to refuse to promote closer relations with Free Churchmen because some, not by any means all, Anglo-Catholics are opposed to such efforts.

Manifestos of this kind ought certainly to be issued from time to time as a reminder of our Christian duty in this matter, but unless they lead to persistent practical action they become vapid. It is action and practice, not merely protestation, which count here.

Evangelicals and Modernists would not wish that Anglo-Catholics should in this matter act against their convictions; all that Modernists and Evangelicals claim is their right to act in accordance with their own convictions. A comprehensive Church ought to be large enough to allow of this.

The policy which is only concerned to conform the Church of England to the unreformed Churches in order to secure closer relations with them must have the effect of separating her more widely from the Free Churches in these islands and finally of making her nothing more than an Anglo-Catholic sect.

THE EXORCISING OF THE DOGMATIC TEMPER

By the Editor.

I.

IMMEDIATELY after the decision of the Bishops of the Northern Province without one dissentient vote, prohibiting any who do not profess the Nicene Creed to preach or lecture at non-statutory services in our English cathedrals and parish churches, Dr. David, Bishop of Liverpool, put forth a reasoned disclaimer of the policy, in a pamphlet entitled, *Who are Christians? An Inquiry into Spiritual Relationships within the Christian Fellowship*.[1]

In his pamphlet Dr. David rightly remarks that the decision of the Northern Convocation

> 'raises a much larger issue which has long been exercising the minds of many who profess and call themselves Christians, and of some who do not.'

The Bishop's pamphlet is a noble plea for Christian reality, comprehensiveness and charity. Our modern needs, as well as our modern knowledge, demand a growing spirit of charity and comprehensiveness in the Christian Churches. This, Dr. David holds, we shall never secure until we accept Christ's values as our values, and in our religious life put the stress where Christ put it. It is not in the verbal profession of formulae, or even in their mental acceptance, that the essential reality of the Christian Religion is to be found. That central reality is the product of the Spirit of Christ operating within the human personality, and manifesting itself in the character and conduct of the individual, fitting him progressively to be a serviceable member in a fellowship permeated by the spirit of freedom, truth and love.

One great enemy of this Spirit is the dogmatic temper, and until this dogmatic temper is exorcized there can be no peace for the Christian Church. The dogmatic temper is the prolific mother of intolerance, exclusiveness, sectarianism. Dr. David writes 'Real divisions between Christians have long ceased to turn upon

[1] Published by the Oxford University Press. Price 1/-. 1934.

> doctrine as the fourth and fifth centuries expressed it, but upon the larger question that stands behind all Christian creeds. Do they or do they not accept Christ's view of life, that is, His revelation of God's will for all human relationships? The issue is a naked alternative of life or death. If the whole Christian world could bring to bear upon that issue all the power entrusted to it, life would win. But separate streams of influence from sects and parties, each absorbed in its own affairs, and resolved to abide within its own ring-fence, are not enough. They fight each other instead of the evils which it is their common mission to overcome . . . Competing forms of faith and order must be restated or harmonized. This kind of negotiation may be entirely necessary, and has almost always led to better personal understanding among the leaders on either side. But what is the end in view? Sometimes it seems as if we were preparing for an ultimate amalgamation, a uniformity of faith and order, in one flock without component folds. But was this ever intended? Might it not be nearer to the Master's mind that we should leave our differences, whether in the expressions of our belief, or the modes of our government, as they stand, and still be wholly one in following Him? What keeps us spiritually asunder, breaking our vital unity, is not some point originally in dispute, but the spirit and the mutual attitude engendered when men insist on pursuing controversies in terms that belong to a bygone age. The differences themselves, essential as they seemed at the time of the severance, have lost much of their significance. They will be settled, if ever, not by the old methods, but in the solvent of a new temper, springing from real obedience to the great commandment of Christ. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Here is the distinguishing mark of the Christian.'

We find ourselves altogether in agreement with Dr. David on this issue. The great factor in healing the divisions and antagonisms of Christendom must be the exorcizing of the dogmatic temper.

II.

Dr. David, however, treats another theme in his pamphlet — a subsidiary one it is true — but nevertheless of great importance at the present time. It is the problem of the traditional Christian Creeds. Here we are compelled, most unwillingly, to find ourselves in disagreement with one with whom we desire to agree.

When Sir Walter Raleigh, on the scaffold, felt with his finger the edge of the headman's axe, he remarked, 'This is a sharp medicine, but it cures all diseases.' Dr. David seems to believe that his medicine, the exorcizing of the dogmatic temper, is the panacea for all the Church's ills to-day, including the vexed problem of the creeds. Now we are quite sure that the exorcizing of the dogmatic temper must be the needful pre-

liminary to the solving of the problem of the creeds, but it alone cannot solve that problem, although it creates the only atmosphere in which that issue can be helpfully and successfully treated.

In dealing with the creeds Dr. David makes much of the imperfections and limitations of human language. He writes :

> ' Words at their best are but imperfect and inconstant vehicles of truth. They gather associations which obscure and even corrupt the meaning they originally bore. Used in translation a word can hardly ever bring into one language the precise content of its " equivalent " in another. Words mean different things to different generations, and to different persons of the same generation. In the service of faith they can never be more than symbols " thrown out as transcendent truths." To carry down unchanging truth we cannot rely on words alone.'

There is great danger of pressing this kind of argument too far. Simple men, and men who are not simple also, believe that it is possible for a civilized man, if he be both clear-headed and sincere, to say what he means and to mean what he says even in the sphere of his religious faith.

One of the great advantages which civilized man possesses over uncivilized man is in the increased precision and adequacy of his language. Mary Kingsley tells us that it is impossible for two West African negroes to talk intelligibly to each other in the dark. ' Come to the fire,' says one to the other, when he fails to understand him, needing facial expression and gesticulation to supplement the spoken word.

Dr. David's argument might even lead to the substitution of symbolism, dramatic action, and incantation for precise and reasoned statements in our public worship. Yet St. Paul said :

> ' In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding that thereby I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.'

And our Lord is reported to have said :

> ' By thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.'

Professor George Salmon remarked to one who depreciated the adequacy of human language for purposes of religious faith :

> ' I have yet to learn that in this matter the tune is everything and the words are nothing.'

The greatest difficulty with some of our dogmatic formulae today is not that we do not know what they mean : we know quite

well what they mean, but we know equally well that we do not mean what they say. Of course there are other cases where, owing to the change in the general meaning of a term, the creed seems to many people to say something which it does not really say; but this is not the greatest difficulty which our creeds present, though it is a difficulty and one which needs to be dealt with.

The Church must have creeds and creeds which must be credible and intelligible. That shrewd churchman Archdeacon Paley maintained that the public services of the Church ought to contain as few controverted statements as possible. The way to deal with creeds which are in some measure incredible and unintelligible is not to tell the world that human language is inadequate for the precise expression of religious faith but to revise our creeds in the light of our modern convictions or to formulate new creeds less incredible and less unintelligible and to allow them to be used at least as optional alternatives to creeds which the passage of time and a changed conception of the creative process have rendered 'uncouth.'

What we need to-day is not an expansion of our creed, but its simplification. Shakespeare wrote of :

> 'Jewels five words long
> Which on the outstretched finger of old Time
> Sparkled for ever.'

Five such jewels will probably suffice for the Church's needs. Some religions, like Islam, have been satisfied with one.

Dr. David's pamphlet might be construed as suggesting that in the matter of religious faith words may be made to mean anything we like them to mean, but such a course can only land us in chaos — well-meaning and emotional chaos, no doubt, but still chaos.

While we need to exorcise the dogmatic temper, we need also to reform our dogmatic formularies. Both are difficult duties but neither may be shirked, and the achievement of the former will make the accomplishment of the latter possible.

We await with eagerness, not unmixed with anxiety, the publication of the findings of the Archbishops' Commission on doctrine, because unless we can secure authoritative re-interpretation, revision and re-formulation of our dogmas, we shall con-

tinue to lose from the ranks of practising Churchmen many intelligent men and women who wish to believe but find our out-of-date dogmatic system a barrier to Church membership.

Dr. David's discerning emphasis upon the realities of the Christian life must needs attract these people to the Christian religion; but to be attracted to the Christian religion is not the same as to become practising members of the Church of England. While the authorities of that Church seem clearly to place its main emphasis upon those things which Christ Himself did not stress, these people will continue to remain outside the Church of England, and according to our Church statistics they would appear to constitute some four-fifths of our population.

PARLIAMENT AND CHURCH REFORM

(I)

By the Rev. Gamaliel Milner, M.A.

MODERN England began with the year 1830, the opening of the Victorian Age. There was a short space during which it seemed uncertain whether the new age might not be smothered at its birth. Had not the English genius for compromise prevailed, there might never have been a Victorian Age at all; monarchy and the aristocracy might have gone down, and few people at that time supposed that the Church of England as by law established would survive the wreck. It was a part of the old order and would naturally perish with it.

The introduction of the Reform Bill in the spring of 1831 sharply divided Englishmen into Reformers and Anti-reformers. The *Quarterly Review* claimed that the clergy were unanimously hostile to the Bill. This, however, appears to have been a gross over-statement, for not only were the leading Broad Churchmen, Whateley, Sydney Smith, Dr. Arnold, decidedly in favour of the measure, but the *Christian Observer*, the organ of the Evangelicals, was on the side of the government. The *British Critic*, the leading Church paper, sought safety in silence. But there was one order of Churchmen that rather unfortunately for the Church had votes in the House of Lords. When the Second

Reading of the Bill was brought forward in the Upper Chamber, Lord Grey addressed a special appeal to the Episcopal Bench in a vein of mingled cajolery and intimidation. 'The Right Reverend Prelates,' he said, 'appear to have felt that the eyes of the country are upon them, that it is necessary for them to set their house in order, and prepare to meet the coming storm.' The phrase about 'setting their house in order' was long remembered against Lord Grey and the Whigs, and it certainly had an ominous sound, particularly to those who recalled that the passage concludes with the words, 'for thou shalt die and not live.'

The appeal met with no response; the only Bishops who voted for the Reform Bill were Maltby, whom the Whigs had just made Bishop of Durham, and Bathurst of Norwich, the friend of Coke of Norfolk. It had been hoped that Blomfield of London, who was credited with liberal views, might have been in his place to support the Government, but he excused himself on the ground of a recent bereavement, and rather spoilt the plea by preaching the next day at the opening of King's College. Subsequently, indeed, King William, acting under pressure from Earl Grey, exercised his royal influence and persuaded some of the bishops to modify their attitude; but five of them were among the Diehards who signed the protest against the Act. One of the protestors was the redoubtable Henry of Exeter, Bishop Phillpotts, whom Greville describes as 'a man of desperate and terrible countenance.'

The opposition of the Bishops to Reform excited general indignation; they were an unpopular class; it was Bishop Wilberforce, as Mr. Hardwick has pointed out in his *Lawn Sleeves*, who rehabilitated the episcopal order; they were rather unfairly made scapegoats for the House of Lords. Not to speak of the Radical press, *The Times* attacked them in unmeasured language. At Canterbury an angry crowd prevented Archbishop Howley from holding a visitation in the cathedral; Bishopthorpe was besieged; the palace of the Bishop of Bristol was burnt down during the riots in that city; Phillpotts' residence at Exeter had to be garrisoned by coastguardsmen; 'Judas Iscariot, Bishop of Worcester,' was scrawled on the cathedral. No bishop ventured to appear at the king's Levée held soon after the rejection of the Bill, and the only clergyman who presented himself,

being unfortunately mistaken for a bishop, was assaulted by a mob outside, and had to be rescued by the police. There was a short but violent spasm of anti-clericalism. Southey was 'apprehensive that no human means are likely to avert the threatened overthrow of the Establishment.'

Arnold of Rugby was an ardent liberal, politically and theologically; he was also a passionate believer in establishment, in a national recognition of religion; in fact, he held the theory that ideally Church and State are but different aspects of the same thing. So did many of his High Church opponents, only the inference they drew was that the Nonconformist or the Papist was not a full British citizen, and ought not to be permitted to exercise the franchise. Arnold abhorred such narrowness. He felt that the Church ought to comprehend the whole Christianity of the nation. In his pamphlet on 'Principles of Church Reform,'[1] published in 1833, he says, 'The reform really needed is to make the Church truly and effectually the Church of England.' 'Nothing, as it seems to me,' he says in a letter to Whateley written at this time, 'can save the Church, but an union with the Dissenters.' It was not the first or the last time that such a sentiment has been expressed; that strong Churchman, Lord Nottingham, had brought forward a Comprehension Bill in 1689, and in the reconstruction period after the War, appeals to all persons of goodwill have emanated from the Lambeth Conference. So far the labours of the Lambeth mountain have brought forth only the somewhat exiguous mouse of the South India Scheme. Arnold's proposals, however, went far beyond those of the Lambeth Conference. His intention was that the Church of England should embrace all Christians except Roman Catholics and, perhaps, Unitarians. If it be asked why Roman Catholics are left out, the answer is that they are not excluded, they exclude themselves. The case of the Unitarian is more difficult. In a letter to a correspondent he says: 'The passage in my pamphlet to which you allude is expressly limited to the case of the Unitarians preserving exactly their present character; that is, as appears by a comparison with what follows, their including many who call themselves Unitarians,

[1] There is an interesting essay on Arnold in the *Modern Churchman* for March, 1913, by the late W. A. Cunningham Craig.

because the name of unbeliever is not yet thought creditable. And these persons are expressly distinguished from those other Unitarians whom I speak of as really Christians.' [2]In another letter he says: 'An Unitarian, as such, is a Christian; that is, if a man follows Christ's law, and believes His words according to his conscientious sense of their meaning, he is a Christian.'[3]

Arnold envisaged a drastic reorganization of the Church; episcopacy was to be retained, but the bishop was to be left scarcely anything but the name; he was not to act except on the advice of a council of clergy and laity. At the morning service the liturgy of the Church of England was to be used, but at other times different forms of worship, including extempore prayers, might be employed in the parish churches; he rather tactlessly advocated this as a way of rescuing Dissenters from the 'utter coarseness and deformity' of their chapels. Arnold's proposals met with scant welcome in any quarter, but there was a distinct tendency even in High Church circles to contemplate the possibility of making concessions. Even the orthodox *British Critic* declared itself willing 'to listen to the proposal for removing the Athansian Creed from our liturgy.'

The wave of anti-clericalism speedily subsided, and, as usually happens, the desire of many for reform passed away, when the Church was no longer felt to be in imminent danger. Dr. Arnold himself, writing to a friend in the year 1840, said: 'My pamphlet was written on the supposition that the Church Establishment was in extreme danger; and therefore I proposed remedies which, although I do still sincerely believe them to be in themselves right and good, yet would be manifestly chimerical had not the danger and alarm, as I supposed, been imminent. Jephson (a medical friend) finds that his patients will adopt a very strict diet, when they believe themselves to be in danger; but he would be very indiscreet if he prescribed it to a man who felt no symptoms of indisposition, for the man would certainly laugh at him, although perhaps the diet would do him good, if he could be induced to adopt it.' One may compare the marked decline in the desire for reunion and for internal reforms which accompanied the passing of the crisis caused by the Great War.

[2] Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, p. 201. [3] *Id.*, p. 305.

But though the desire for heroic measures and drastic changes quickly subsided with the danger that had called it forth, there was left behind a decided feeling in favour of a better use of the Church's revenues and the abatement of jobs and sinecures. As at the present day, the younger generation were more serious than their elders. The post-war phase of irresponsibility and licence was passing, and the Victorian with his good and bad qualities was emerging. He might be narrow and limited, but he was in earnest. The most typical figure of the younger generation was Sir Robert Peel, the commercial baronet who combined the culture of Oxford with the shrewdness of Lancashire. Sir Robert in his Tamworth manifesto, which is often regarded as the charter of the modern Conservative Party, declared himself in favour of a better distribution of the revenues of the Church, though opposed to their alienation to secular uses. His brother-in-law, Robert Eden Henley, afterwards Lord Henley, founded in 1832 the Church Reform Association. Archbishop Howley, the mildest of men and Archbishops, of excellent intentions and blameless character, but inflicted with an incurable timidity, brought forward measures dealing with pluralities and tithe, but they were of so feeble a kind that they excited no interest and expired of inanition.

A fortnight after the passing of the Reform Bill, a Commission was appointed to inquire into the revenues of the Church; it did not issue its report till 1834. But in the meantime the rumour of its activities created considerable excitement among the clergy, which was increased by the Irish Church Bill of 1833. This measure proposed to abolish two of the archbishoprics and eight of the bishoprics of the Church of the Protestant minority in Ireland, and to reduce the revenues of certain of the richest sees; the funds thus saved were to be used in the augmentation of small livings and the building and upkeep of churches. In March 1832 a new Church magazine had been founded called the *British Magazine*, which was to play a part in the early stages of the Oxford Movement somewhat similar to that played by the *Church Times* in the later stages. The editor was Dr. Rose, the Cambridge man who started the Oxford Movement. With him were associated Palmer, Keble, Newman and Hurrell Froude. In the autumn of the year it published a

series of articles on Church Reform in which it defended plurality and non-residence as necessary evils, the Irish Bill, for which, by the way, eleven bishops had been weak enough to vote, it described as an 'atrocious measure.'

On July 14th, a day which we were all without distinction of party invited to celebrate last year, Keble beat the drum ecclesiastic in his sermon before the Judges in Assize. His text was, 'As for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you, but I will teach you the good and the right way,' the words of the prophet Samuel when he deplored the abandonment of theocracy and the establishment of a monarchy. The nation, Keble maintained, was drifting into national apostasy. 'Disrespect to the clergy involves enmity to Him who gave them their commission.' To be slack in the Lord's service was to imitate 'the impious liberality of Saul in sparing the Amalekites.' Keble's expressions were general, and he left his hearers to make the application, but in the preface to his sermon when published he said, 'The calamity in anticipation of which it was written has actually overtaken a portion of the Church of God.' The reference was, of course, to Ireland.

The issue of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry had a somewhat reassuring effect, for if it revealed much that was unsatisfactory, it showed that there had been much exaggeration on the part of the Radicals of the wealth of the Church and of the incomes of the bishops. The total revenue of the Church, it appeared, amounted to only three and a half million and not nine million as had been freely asserted in anti-clerical publications. Nevertheless there was obviously an overwhelming case for reform, and in 1835 Peel appointed the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Commission, consisting of the principal Officers of State and certain of the bishops, which ultimately developed into the Ecclesiastical Commission. Legislation founded on its recommendations was carried through Parliament during the next few years. The results may be briefly summarized. The aggregate income of the bishops was not reduced, it was even slightly augmented at the expense of the Chapters of Westminster and St. Paul's, but their revenues were redistributed so as to make them more equal. Dioceses were rearranged and two new sees were established, Ripon and Manchester, in the indus-

trial north. The management of episcopal estates was gradually transferred to the Commissioners, and Bishops were forbidden to hold other offices *in commendam*.

The Commission of Inquiry was converted in 1836 into the Ecclesiastical Commission. This body at first contained a majority of laymen, but by the Cathedral Act of 1840 all the Diocesan Bishops and the Deans of Canterbury, St. Paul's and Westminster became *ex-officio* members. In 1850 the Estates Committee was created by statute. It consists of two laymen appointed by the Crown and one by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In our own days the position of First Estates Commissioner was held for many years by Sir Lewis Dibdin, and he has published a very interesting pamphlet on the History and Work of the Ecclesiastical Commission showing how much it has done towards the creation of new parishes, the improvement of underpaid benefices, and the erection of Parsonage houses. Writing in 1919, just before the establishment of the Church Assembly, he concludes with the following impressive warning, the wisdom of which has been but too well verified during the last ten years :

> 'It is almost inevitable that the present inrush of schemes of Church Reform and Development should create a demand for wider powers and more lavish expenditure. But it cannot be too strongly insisted that dispersion of aim in the case of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would be disastrous to the Church of England, because it would only be secured at the expense of the parochial clergy, by withdrawing funds which have been devoted by law to their support and are sadly inadequate to that purpose. It would be almost a tragedy if the parochial clergy, who always hitherto have been lamentably underpaid, were now to be despoiled of the results of long years of careful management.'[4]

We shall see when we come to consider the present situation that a determined attempt is being made by a party in the Church Assembly to divert the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission from the work of the Church in the parishes.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were constituted the residuary legatees of the Church. But where was the money to come from to establish new parishes in the industrial districts? No immediate gain was to be expected from the episcopal estates, though it was expected, and the expectation has been justified,

[4] *The Ecclesiastical Commission: A Sketch of its History and Work*, by Sir Lewis T. Dibdin and Stanford Edwin Downing, p. 120.

that the increased value of their lands, particularly those belonging to the see of London with its ground rents and the see of Durham with its coal mines, would one day provide very considerable funds. The principal source from which supplies could be drawn was the revenues of the cathedral chapters. It was estimated that the incomes of the cathedral chapters and collegiate churches amounted to £274,000. There were also sixty-two sinecure rectories worth £17,000. Many of the prebendaries and officials of the cathedrals were non-residents and discharged no duties of any sort. The Cathedral Act of 1840 transferred all or most of the property to the Commissioners, who were to pay a fixed annual stipend to the reduced staff of the cathedrals. A large number of prebends and canonries were to be abolished at the deaths of their then holders. In this way a sum of £140,000 a year was gradually realized.[5]

By the time the Cathedrals Act was passed into law, the attitude of the bishops had become appreciably modified. This was partly due to a change in the composition of the Episcopal Bench. Ten years of Whig Government had made a difference; there had been a rather unusual mortality among the bishops; Melbourne, who found making ecclesiastical appointments rather a bore, peevishly complained that they died to spite him. Blomfield, the most energetic among the prelates, was a moderate reformer and carried many of his colleagues with him; he had considerable influence on the Commission; Vernon Harcourt said: 'Till Blomfield comes we all sit and mend our pens and talk about the weather.' Uncharitable people pointed out that the scheme for the reorganization of the chapters meant a considerable increase in episcopal patronage. 'The bishops,' said Tavistock, Lord John Russell's brother, to Greville, 'have grasped at patronage with both hands.' Lord John Russell at one of the meetings of the Commission scribbled a note and threw it across to Vernon Harcourt of York: 'I don't mind your robbing one another, but I can't let you rob the Crown.' Sydney Smith in his Letters to Archdeacon Singleton drew a lurid picture of the Bishops allying themselves with the Radicals to rob the innocent prebendaries. The public laughed at his sallies, but was not convinced by them.

[5] See *English Church Reform, 1815—1840*, Mathieson.

There was one quarter, however, in which the Ecclesiastical Commission and all its works remained anathema. In 1838 the *British Critic*, which had hitherto been moderately sympathetic with reform, passed under the control of the party whom Arnold called the Oxford Malignants; Newman became editor and inaugurated the new régime by a violent onslaught on Liberalism in all its forms. He called the Revolution of 1688 'a foul and horrible sin.' In the April number there was an article of portentous length from the pen of Dr. Pusey. He denounced the Church Commissions as clearly illegal, and, agreeing for once with Sydney Smith, declared it 'a sorry exhibition' that the episcopal Commissioners should 'transfer to their own order what belonged to another.'

Another very valuable reform which belongs to this decade was the Commutation of Tithe Act, passed by Parliament in 1836; it substituted a fixed payment in money for the old payment in kind, and made the landowners responsible for the tithe. The first change removed a fruitful ground of dispute between parson and people, and the second, till the break-up of the great estates after the War, made the farmer, who was usually a tenant, uninterested in the question of disestablishment.

In matters ecclesiastical as in matters secular the Victorian Age began with a compromise. The most glaring abuses were removed, but no radical change was effected. With regard to the distribution of the revenues of the Church, what Mr. Hubert Handley calls 'the fatal opulence of Bishops' was suffered to continue. Infidels and Dissenters sometimes indulged in gibes about the contrast between the poverty of the Apostles and the wealth of those who claimed to be their successors, but the average Englishman of the upper classes regarded such manifestations as in bad taste; after all, bishops were members of the House of Lords, and it was proper that they should have incomes comparable to those of their fellow-peers. Indeed, their lordships had no difficulty in showing that, considering the position they had to keep up, their salaries were positively inadequate. Benefices continued to be most unequally endowed, and there was little relation between the work to be done and the remuneration to be enjoyed; but some of the richest ears of

corn were lopped off by special Acts of Parliament: Doddington in Cambridgeshire is no longer worth £7,306; its surplus income has been distributed among the neighbouring parishes; in other cases the general funds of the Commissioners have benefited by the curtailment of redundant stipends. But enough inequality remained to make the Church, regarded as a profession, what Sydney Smith bluntly called a lottery, in which the prize-winners owed their success to luck or favour rather than to merit. The social position of the clergy continued to be fairly high; it was probably never higher than about the middle of the nineteenth century; the middle-classes were getting richer and supplied a constant stream of men with private means, ready to accept the worst-paid livings and to supplement the inadequate stipends out of their private resources or those of their wives. The weakness of the system was that it depended so much on the continuance of social conditions which have proved transitory.

Nothing whatever was done to give the ordinary layman a share in the choice of his minister or to check the introduction of irritating novelties into the ritual of the parish church when the Oxford Movement entered upon its second phase, that of Ceremonialism. One reform, indeed, was introduced almost by accident: the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council became the final court of appeal in charges of heresy against the clergy. When in the sixties scientific discovery and Biblical criticism came into conflict with the old conception of orthodoxy, it was this lay tribunal that protected the liberals and saved for them a place in the Church.

The union with the Dissenters in which Arnold had seen the one way of safety for the Church remained a dream. They and the Irish Roman Catholics were becoming too powerful politically to be denied the rights of citizenship. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 made it no longer necessary for office holders to take the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. No longer was the voice of the verger heard in Westminster Abbey saying, 'Will those gentlemen who are communicating in order to qualify for office please come up first to the Altar rails?' Religious men had long shuddered at a profanation which, in the words of Cowper, made

'the symbol of atoning grace
An office key, a pick-lock to a place.'

Religious tests, however, lingered on at the Universities till 1870. The High Church revival interposed new barriers between the Church and the Protestant Nonconformists, and the latter, including the Methodists, who until 1830 had generally stood aloof from politics, gradually drifted into a more or less hostile attitude towards the Church. Roman Catholic Emancipation had been opposed by the majority of the bishops, and one of the minority who voted for it, Bishop Lloyd of Oxford, declared that he witnessed the change with fear and agony and sorrow. As time went on, the Irish Nationalist was found in alliance with the Nonconformist Radical against the Church of England.

It is, perhaps, in the nature of things that there has never been any adequate recognition on the part of the Church of the great services rendered by Parliament to the cause of religion. Law reform is not usually popular with lawyers or Church reform with Churchmen, though, as a matter of fact, the great mass of the clergy owe more to Parliament than they do to Convocation or to the Church Assembly. It is true that the reformation imposed on the Church did not go far enough; statesmen cannot move in advance of public opinion, and the violent diatribes vented by Newman, Keble and their associates against quite moderate changes show how strong were the forces of reaction. Such as they were, the reforms added materially to the efficiency of the Church and enabled it to profit from the revival of religion that was going on all over Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century. Altered conditions have made necessary more drastic reforms than would have seemed possible a hundred years ago. Will Parliament again help the Church to set its house in order, or will the Church seek for a divorce from the State, and try to lead its own life apart from it? That is the question of the moment.

TO WHOM SHALL WE GO?

By Dorothy Emmet, M.A., Lecturer in Philosophy at Armstrong College, University of Durham in Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE Editor has asked me to write and give the point of view of a young member of the Modern Churchmen's Union on some of the issues raised by the decision of the York Convocation over the 'Liverpool controversy.' Fools rush in where angels fear to tread; but the Editor's kindness in offering me a means of asking a question which is bewildering me, and, I find, a good many of my contemporaries, makes me feel that I must take the risks of folly. But what I have to say is simply my own point of view for what it is worth, written on my own responsibility. Some of my contemporaries, I know, would agree; a good many more, probably, would not agree. I always distrust people who claim to speak for 'Youth' with a capital 'Y.' Why should all young people be supposed to think alike? And the important differences of outlook seem to have very little to do with youth and age.

So I must start by saying what, broadly speaking, is my own position. I was brought up, as members of the Modern Churchmen's Union may readily believe, with every chance of learning a sane and living interpretation of Christianity from my father. Since his death I have lived as a student of ancient philosophy, theology and modern philosophy, and have found the traditional statements of Christian doctrines become increasingly more difficult; and yet the teaching of my father and of others has left me with an inescapable sense that the intuitions behind most of those statements stand for something profoundly true. My instinct has therefore been not to be anxious overmuch. In the end, we can face vagueness and uncertainty in expressing what we believe so long as we know we are growing and learning. I like to think that faith can be the opposite, not of ignorance and uncertainty, but of fear; that in the end we can even face an ultimate ignorance and find we are not afraid. An ignorance, that is to say, of definitely formulated intellectual beliefs; our commitment to our intuition of the kind of life we know to be worth living is something of which we can be sure. And if we have had

our eyes opened to this kind of life from seeing it in Jesus, we know that he has laid his hand on us and that somehow he is our Lord.

But if we want to grow in our discipleship through worship and service in an active membership of the Church, there comes a point when the difficulties of language become acute. And the real issue, I believe, is missed if we try, as some people are trying, to interpret the conflict as one between the 'letter' and 'spirit' of Christianity. The real difficulty is that there are two fundamentally different attitudes of mind, and both are held with complete sincerity in an endeavour to express the spirit of the Christian Faith. The first is the attitude of those who think that the Church has a core of doctrines to which it must be absolutely loyal. However liberal and radical its thought may be about everything else, there are certain things which are absolute, and which cannot be shaken by the passing fashions of modern thought: they form, in fact, the standard by which that thought must be judged. So we are told that the Church exists for the worship of the Holy Trinity; that the basis of reunion is to be the Nicene theology; that those who cannot accept the Nicene formulations are not to be allowed to preach in Anglican churches. To give way on this point is looked on as an act of disloyalty. And this is an attitude of mind which we cannot but respect. I do not believe it ought to be looked on as a concern for the letter and not for the spirit, or merely as a defensive attitude. Given its premises, its conclusion is inevitable.

But besides the many intermediate points of view, there is also the attitude of mind of those of us who are unable, however much we may wish it, to express our faith in the traditional forms. We may not have come to this lightly; we may have tried our best to study the meaning of those forms in their historical setting; and the only result has been to emphasize the difference between that world of thought and ours. The slow struggle of civilization for the achievement of free minds has given us some things of which the ancient world knew very little: the sense for historical fact and its distinction from allegory; the different attitude to revelation and authority; the distinguishing of different kinds of evidence, and the power (which Socrates and Plato understood, but their followers did not) of holding a suspended

judgment where evidence is incomplete. Above all, we have learnt to think of the world, not in terms of substance, but in terms of growth, and we are beginning to learn to think about it in terms of personality. We are living in a time of changes in intellectual outlook which are far more far-reaching than the changes of the Reformation, and probably even more far-reaching than the changes made in Greek philosophy in the early period of Christian thought. At present we are still in the bewildering stage when many of our ultimate concepts, both in science and in philosophy, are known to be tentative and provisional.

This means that the historical credal expressions of Christianity cannot be our starting point. For we have chosen to face as fully as we can the complexity of modern thinking and make what we can of it. And this will need courage and patience. We need also to ask the patience of the traditionalists, for we may seem only to be making a very few definite assertions of belief in a recognizably Christian form. For we must use language that is real to us : that is the price and condition of growth. Perhaps we shall have to start simply from the call to take our part in the great corporate venture of civilization which Professor Whitehead describes, in Plato's phrase, as 'the victory of Persuasion over Force.' To some of us, as we give ourselves to this, may come a sense that we are not alone ; that even if our civilization fall, what we believe to be its real values are part of a yet greater venture of the Divine Persuasion. And then we believe we begin to find our citizenship in the *Civitas Dei*—'that most glorious society and celestial city of God's faithful, which is partly seated in the course of these declining times . . . and partly in that solid estate of eternity.'

But what about our citizenship in the visible Church? This is now defined as 'those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity.' Many of us (unless we are Quakers or Unitarians or Salvationists) were, perhaps fortunately, baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity at a month old, before we had begun to wonder how we acknowledge three Persons in one Substance when we don't believe in substance. (Here again the difficulty may be partly one of language. I can think of the grace of our Lord Jesus

Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit as phrases expressing what is profoundly real. But I cannot think of them metaphysically in terms of the Athanasian Creed.)

'Belief in our Lord Jesus Christ,' the Convocation has clearly stated, means not simply the ability to say from the bottom of our heart, 'Master, to whom else shall we go, for thou hast the words of eternal life?' but to say 'Very God of very God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was made man.' Where we really want clear guidance is as to whether the Bishops mean by their decision that the Nicene form is essential, or whether what they are really concerned to do is to safeguard a faith in the redemptive power of Christ. I have no doubt that the Bishops do not really wish to exclude those of us who cannot express our faith in terms of Nicene theology from membership in the Church or even from communion, but it seems clear that we are being told that we must be simply inarticulate lay members. We must not ourselves teach, and we must only listen to the teaching of those who can use traditional language. It is true that in one way we can get beyond language; that anyone who has a genuine experience of God can teach us something, even if he puts that experience into words that are not our words. But when we come to the intellectual side we can be helped most by those who have travelled further along the road that we are travelling ourselves, and can speak to us in language in which we are at home. I think the Bishop of Liverpool understands this, and tried to help us by inviting preachers who, he believed, had a contribution to make and could speak in other than traditional terms.

But even if we disregard the difficulty of not being able to teach or hear the kind of teaching that may help us most inside the Church; even if we are sheltered from the almost insuperable problems which confront the man of this outlook who wants to be ordained or who has already entered the ministry, there still remains the sense of unfairness. We are being allowed privileges from which others with whom we may feel a complete unity of mind and purpose are being excluded.

It is puzzling to see why people so often talk as though there were no alternative between full acceptance of the Nicene theology and 'mere humanitarianism.' The latter is certainly not

fair description of many Unitarians or other 'unorthodox' Christians. Even if we do not think of orthodoxy in its popular (and probably unorthodox) sense as implying a 'three-storey universe,' the phrase 'came down from heaven' still has its very real difficulty. This difficulty is not that our alternative is a merely human 'Jesus of History,' but that the trend of our philosophy, as far as we can see it, is leading us to a sense, not of pantheism, but of the immanence in the world of a transcendant Divine Persuasion, shown through a long process of growth, which culminates in man's winning of free moral responsibility, and so the capacity to apprehend an eternal world, which is not simply a world of abstract values, but the living environment of his spirit. Dr. Oman has taught us to think of grace, not as the irresistible operation of an omnipotent will, but as the gracious companionship with our spirits of a Divine Persuasion which never violates our freedom though it may gradually more and more possess us. May we also think of the Divinity of our Lord as won by the fullest human response to the outgoing grace of God?

I suppose the real difficulty here is that many people look on the heart of the Christian gospel as the affirmation that man cannot reach God by his own efforts; that there is no way from man to God but that there is a way from God to man, and that in Christ God has come down to man and found him. This is the centre of Barthianism, as far as I can understand it (which is only from very far off), and it has also been put very beautifully by Fr. Kelly in *The Gospel of God*. Dr. Nygren finds it implied in his extremely illuminating, and I am sure right, distinction of *Agape* and *Eros*. But at the end of the day I come back from all these paradoxes and antinomies of God and man to the gentler, but no less penetrating, teaching of a Christian Humanism; to Dr. Oman and his 'gracious companionship'—on the one hand the outgoing love of the Divine Persuasion; on the other, the response of a free moral will; and revelation as the growing insight and sensibility which comes from the intermingling of the two.

The orthodox doctrines of the person of Christ attempted to safeguard his real humanity, to avoid the notion, which the Hellenistic world was only too ready to accept, of a demi-god in

disguise. But we are learning to get away from the fundamentally dualistic nature of most Greek metaphysics, in which the gulf between the spiritual and material orders needs to be bridged by some kind of mediator. Jesus gave people a certainty of the power of God as an active presence with them — 'Emmanuel,' 'God with us.' He comes as the culminating figure of the Hebrew prophetic tradition, a tradition whose teaching was based not on dialectic and polemic theology, but on a penetrating intuitive experience of the nature of God. In Him we see prophetic intuition in its supreme form, bringing Him to a sense of a personal relation of sonship which made Him able to enter into the purpose of God in a unique way. But was He used as the chief actor in a fore-ordained plan or drama of man's salvation, or was His complete responsiveness to the Divine Persuasion that of a free moral will, showing us what God-filled human personality can become? We may believe in His uniqueness and yet think of it as, to use technical language, an accidental and not a metaphysical uniqueness. That is to say, there is no reason in the nature of things that it should only have happened once, though, historically, we are never likely to see again anything like that one life, standing out from its background of prophetic religion, with the light of the Divine Persuasion shining through its tragedy. We can recall phrases such as 'The first born of many brethren,' 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God and it doth not yet appear what we shall be,' 'The whole creation . . . waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God'; but we hardly dare read them, and grow from being children to being sons of God by taking the way of one who did take His heritage of sonship. But our 'gospel' is that one did take it: we have seen the glory of what God and man together can become.

Whatever be the final outcome of New Testament criticism for those willing to follow the argument whithersoever it leads; whatever the original circumstances of those sayings and parables in that strange world of first century Judaism, there remains the universality of a supreme intuition into the nature of righteousness and mercy. Whatever the ultimate meaning of those strange, confused stories of the Resurrection, there remains the conviction of the early Church and of all generations of Christians, that in the final meeting place of life and death of one who had

given His body to be broken for the life of the world a new life had been born. And therefore we believe that a redemptive power comes from Him.

Prof. Whitehead has said that Buddhism has on the whole been static because it is a philosophy generating a religion, whereas Christianity is a religion seeking a philosophy. If this be true, the basis of the dynamic religion cannot be its formulation in a particular set of concepts. Such concepts are an attempt to clarify and hold fast a living intuition.[1] Sometimes the intuition may be an apprehension of a new quality or value which our organized ideas are not adequate to express. The early Church sought to interpret its intuition of the creative and redemptive quality of the life of Christ in terms of Greek metaphysics. Many to-day can still express their faith quite sincerely in those same terms. But can the Church be inclusive enough to give full scope also to those of us to whom it is vital to learn to express what we believe to be the original Christian intuition in the terms of the world of thought in which our lives are spent?[2] Are we to be able to grow in this attempt within the visible Church? If not, it must mean that new exploring in some realms of thought can only go on outside the Church, surely to the great impoverishment of that thought. For the Christian tradition has shown us that creative thought comes not just from individualist thinkers, but also from corporate experience in a corporate venture. Now some ventures start from a clear formulation of aims and agreement. But these, I should suggest, are primarily of the nature of legal transactions. In others we start from some-

[1] By 'intuition' I here mean a discernment that certain facts of historical experience have significance or value. I should hold that some measure of intuitive apprehension of significance is the immediate element in all knowing. This apprehension we then try to interpret intellectually by relating it to our organized world of ideas. But the primary intuition of quality or significance is *not* an apprehension of propositions as bearing their own warrant of certainty. (This is not invalidated by the fact that 'intuition' is sometimes used to mean the apprehension of formal self-evidence in logic and mathematics; for this is a special case in which the apprehension of propositions as self-evident is made possible by their formal character.)

[2] Of course it would be dishonest to claim that our Christology is 'just the same thing in other words.' We must be prepared to recognize that it is in many ways an alternative interpretation, which may very well be mistaken. But the point is that those of us who find ourselves led to holding it believe that we also are seeking to express the intuition which contains the Christian gospel.

thing which inspires us to a common purpose of constructing or discovering something we believe to be worth while. We see a direction ahead in which we should go, and as we go clearer expressions of agreed conviction may emerge as the result of what we learn in the course of the venture itself. Some would claim that the creeds of the Church are final formulations of this kind. To others they are rather milestones along the way, classic expressions of Christian intuition in the terms of their time. We value them as part of the heritage of the Christian tradition. But that does not mean that we are prepared to accept them as tests of Christian profession.

The point is often made that since in our age of uncertainty and transition we cannot formulate a new creed, it is better to hold to the old. With this I absolutely agree, if we may use the old creeds as classic hymns of worship, and if, should we personally be called on to make a profession of faith, we may do so in words which we can use prayerfully and triumphantly, not with mental gymnastics and reservations. I myself find that I could use some Johannine sentences in this way, for even if I only begin to grasp them now, I feel I can go on growing into an insight of what each clause might mean. They seem more universal and closer to us than the creeds, perhaps because they are nearer to the rock from which we are hewn.

'We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

'We believe that God is light, and that if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

'We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

'We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God has given to us eternal life and this life is in His Son.

'We believe that we are children of God and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

'We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

'We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

Of course, the Church is not primarily, thank God, the Church of philosophers, but the Church of all sorts and condi-

tions of men. And those of us whose special task is to think need perhaps more than most the contact and fellowship of those who are living other and different lives from our own, lest our thought itself become individualistic and unreal. And all of us, whether we are thinkers or not, need above all to come to the sense that we are not our own, that we are within God's purpose, and that we can share in the redemptive life of Christ. If we are pledged to the slower way of exploration in thought, we must clearly be prepared for the tension of living in a society which has traditions and affirmations into which we cannot fully enter. Has a Catholic Church a place for such as us? The answer will turn on whether the pronouncement that membership in the visible Church is based on acceptance of the formulations of Nicaea is intended in a literal sense, or whether it really means that the Church is based on a loyalty to the redemptive Love of God which we see in Jesus. What this means in philosophical language can never be said finally, and in the last resort its full meaning escapes definition. If we believe that we hold that loyalty, and yet express it to ourselves intellectually in other terms, is there to be a place for us in the fellowship of worship and service of the visible Church?

THE ASCENSION*

'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive.'
—*Psalm* lxviii, 18.

THESE are the words which, as we know from the Epistle to the Ephesians, suggested themselves to the early Christians as descriptive of the final triumph of their risen Lord. Jesus had been captive, He had moved even among the spirits in their prison, but God had loosed the pains of death, for it was not possible for Him to be holden thereby. Thus did God exalt Him, and gave Him the name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Thus by the cross, by death, by resurrection, by exaltation was Jesus 'glorified.'

*A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Ascension Day, 1934, by the Reverend P. Gardner-Smith, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College.

There is little in the New Testament to suggest that the earliest Church made a clear distinction between the resurrection and the ascension, or that all its members thought of the two events as successive. They were concerned to proclaim the triumph of their Lord over death, and His exaltation to the Lordship over all the world, but they did not at first show much concern for the outward manifestation of His victory. Jesus had risen; He had been seen by His disciples; thus He was 'declared by God to be His Son in power according to the spirit of Holiness'—and that was enough. But as time passed there was occasion for reflexion and controversy. What exactly did the survival of Jesus imply? What was the manner of His resurrection? What evidence could be produced? It was not only sceptics outside the Church who asked such questions, but the Christians themselves who found in the earliest testimony of eye-witnesses material for speculation. It is significant that our earliest authority, St. Paul, makes no reference to the empty tomb in setting forth the evidence of the resurrection; whereas the latest authority, St. John, lays all the emphasis upon the investigations of the two disciples in the garden. The earliest evangelist (St. Mark), though he describes the experiences of the women at the tomb, adds that they did not make public their discovery, so that it was not on their testimony that the Church's faith was founded. Even to the other synoptic writers such reticence was incredible, and both Matthew and Luke tell how they proclaimed the news.

It is not difficult to reconstruct the process of the Church's thought. First came the experience of continued communion with the Master; then the inference, however well founded, that if He still lived His body must have been raised from the grave; then a reinterpretation of the adventure of the women, stages of which are clearly discernible in the Gospels; and then an endeavour to exhibit the fact of the empty tomb as the most compelling proof of the resurrection. Hence the additions of the later evangelists—the guard at the sepulchre described by St. Matthew and pseudo-Peter, and the two angels inside the tomb described by Luke and John.

But this change of emphasis dictated by the needs of apologetic had far-reaching consequences. As it sprang from the simple

materialism of Jewish thought, so it encouraged a materialistic conception of the Master's triumph. It was not enough to proclaim Him living; the task of Christian apologetic was now to establish His physical substantiality after the resurrection. St. Paul had been satisfied with a voice from Heaven and a blinding light, but a later generation demanded more tangible proof. They must be assured that the actual body which had been laid in the tomb appeared afterwards to the disciples and continued its physical existence. It must be a body that occupied space, that exhibited the marks of the passion, that could be handled, that was even capable of assimilating food—else there could be no guarantee of the resurrection. Hence the modification and amplification of earlier traditions. St. Luke's account of the appearance to the Twelve is very remarkable. The point established is not so much the *identity* of Jesus as His *substantiality*: 'They were terrified and affrighted and supposed that they beheld a spirit. But He said unto them, See my hands and my feet that it is I myself. Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold me having. And they gave Him a piece of broiled fish, and He took it and did eat before them.' To speak of Luke's 'anti-docetism' is to miss the point. The third evangelist is concerned to prove not the reality of the Lord's manhood, but the material reality of the risen body. It was not merely a *spirit* that had been manifested to the disciples, but the *body* of Jesus reanimated and raised from the grave.

That this apologetic was popular we cannot doubt, and it has shaped the late story of Thomas in the Fourth Gospel. Thomas had been incredulous, and his faith could only be established by an invitation to feel the wounds of the spear and the nails. The proof could add nothing to the evidence of his eyes except the assurance that the Lord had a material body and was no mere disembodied Spirit.

This was the assurance that the Church felt it needed to meet Jewish scepticism, and under the compulsion of this need the primary evidence for the resurrection came to be no longer the testimony of those who had seen the risen Lord, but the story of the women, which, if it could be established, seemed to prove that the tomb was empty and the actual body buried by Joseph had been raised from the grave. So we pass from I Cor. xv

which ignores the evidence of the women, to Lk. xxiv and Jn. xx, in which all the emphasis is on the empty tomb.

The change is to be regretted. Historical criticism makes it clear that the real evidence of the resurrection is to be sought where first it was found in the testimony of the Lord's disciples, who were utterly convinced that they had seen their Master. The narratives of the discovery of the empty tomb, however interesting, are too late and too contradictory to bear the weight which Christian apologetic has laid upon them.

The development of Christian thought in a materialistic direction had further consequences. When once it was accepted that Jesus had appeared with a solid body, the question must arise as to what had become of that body. After a short time further manifestations of the risen Christ were neither expected nor experienced, for St. Paul says, 'Last of all He appeared to me also.' Where then had He gone? At first the answer seems to have been indefinite, 'He was parted from His disciples'—as in the earlier text of St. Luke. But Christian imagination could not long be content with such a statement. Jesus was in Heaven; Heaven was somewhere in the skies; therefore Jesus, with His body of flesh and bones, had been carried up into Heaven. We are not left to speculate here. All the stages of the growth of the tradition are exemplified in the New Testament. First there is St. Paul, whose thought combines a belief in the exaltation and the abiding presence of Christ. Then the First Gospel, which makes the final scene a farewell, but says no word of an ascension. Then the early text of St. Luke, which speaks vaguely of 'a parting.' Then the later text which adds 'and was carried up into Heaven.' And finally the Acts, which represents Jesus as abiding forty days with His disciples and then carried up into a cloud with an appropriate escort of angels.

To the modern mind the difficulty of accepting this developed narrative is undoubtedly serious. It is closely associated with a conception of the Universe in three storeys, and we who hold no such notion find it strange and fantastic. We can see how the story grew, and why it grew, and we realise how weak is the evidence on which it rests. If we accept it, it is difficult to see how religious faith is strengthened. We do not think of God as seated on a visible throne in a local Heaven, nor of Christ as seated at

God's right hand in any literal sense. Nor do we believe that by any process of levitation Jesus can have been brought nearer to the presence of the Father. All such phrases belong to the picture language of religion, and they are part of an attempt to express the truth of Christ's exaltation in language which belongs to an age other than our own. We must surely distinguish between the truth and its embodiment. The triumph of our Lord over death and His enthronement over all the world are at once facts of history and the ideal of religious aspiration; but the notion that His material body was carried up into the clouds is a childish attempt to express the Church's faith in an age whose intellectual background was wholly different from our own. As to the history, the most we can say is that something may have happened on the occasion of the Lord's last appearance to His friends which indicated that the old intercourse was now at an end, and that later this 'something' came to be interpreted as an 'Ascension.' But what happened we shall never know, and it is not important that we should. If the 'ascension' may be taken as a picturesque anticipation of the final glorification of our divine Lord, then we accept it and hold it fast; but if it means that a material body was miraculously wafted into the clouds, then many of us do not accept it, and it is quite time that we said so without ambiguity.

But what of the Creeds, and the plain statements which they contain? The Creeds are retained by our Church as providing the norm of Christian belief, and without doubt they were composed by men who accepted their statements in a naïve and literal sense. They did believe that Christ descended into Hades, and that after His physical resurrection His very body was taken into Heaven, whence ere long the visible form of Christ would be seen descending to judgement. Day by day we recite these ancient formularies, but no educated Christian accepts them in their original sense. We claim the right to interpret them in the light of modern knowledge.

Two questions arise which are yearly becoming more urgent. Are there any limits to this freedom of interpretation? And, must the ancient creeds be for ever retained? On the first question opinions differ sharply. There is something like agree-

ment that one or two clauses of the Creed can and must be 'spiritualized.' The descent into Hell is even less easy to accept literally than the ascent into Heaven; and whatever we may understand by the return to future judgment, few can believe on that subject anything like what was believed by the early Church.

But if some clauses are to be reinterpreted, why not others? Where can a line be drawn? If orthodoxy may dwell exclusively on the spiritual significance of the ascension, can a like freedom be denied to 'heterodoxy' in the interpretation of the Virgin Birth or the physical resurrection? Is the former more than an early attempt to express the truth of the Incarnation, and the latter an affirmation for simple folk of the truth of Christ's victory over death?

On this question there has been a somewhat profitless controversy between those who believe themselves to be traditionalists and those who in this modern world are less afraid of the title 'modernist.' The controversy is not closed, but there can be no doubt as to the issue. No man in the twentieth century can hold the faith of the first, and where all are innovators it is hardly possible to draw a line of pardonable innovation, and censure all who cross it. Some opinions more than others belong to the main stream of Christian thought and may therefore be described as 'orthodox'; but the modern world is more interested in truth than in orthodoxy, and in the end it must be left to each man to decide whether his conception of truth is Christian or not.

What then of the second question, the continued use of the creeds? The Church of to-day has inherited these ancient formularies, and many of its members regard them with a passionate devotion as the standards under which generations of the faithful have fought. That this devotion is often more sentimental than rational may be true, but it inspires a formidable opposition to any suggestion that the Creeds might be revised or that their use might be made occasional or optional. Opposition to change is the more to be regarded inasmuch as it comes from several quarters. It comes from those to whom conservatism and religion are almost identical. It comes also from those who would follow no course, however clearly recommended by reason, which might lead us further from fellowship with the great unchanging Church of Rome. It comes too from some who realize

that all formularies are but approximations to truth, and since we cannot know all things it is better to express our partial understanding in words hallowed by tradition than to attempt to bring our creeds into temporary agreement with the ever-changing phases of modern thought. There is reason in this last objection, and it rules out any idea of constructing a comprehensive modern creed. But it is of less force against the plea, now heard with increasing urgency, that there should be *alternative creeds* expressing in a few words the fundamentals of Christian faith free from historical statements which are impossible to prove and of doubtful relevance to religion. If they would, the bishops could draw up a creed in a few lines declaring our belief in God and our faith in the revelation of His Son, which convictions are the real bond of Christian fellowship. And if such a creed were allowed to be used as an alternative to the Apostles' Creed it would be clear to all that the Church of to-day, while claiming continuity with the Church of the Fathers, yet enjoys that freedom of thought and interpretation without which it can have no appeal to the modern world.

Permission to use some such simple declaration of faith would alienate a few to whom tradition is more than truth, and it might disturb some who have hardly thought deeply enough to be conscious of our present perplexities; but it would be a profound relief to many whole-hearted Christians who groan under the necessity of using forms which they cannot accept in their natural sense, but who shrink from the alternative of leaving the fellowship of their Church. Their number is greater than many would have us suppose.

'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive.'

So we believe in a sense deeper than any childish notion of physical levitation. Nineteen centuries have revealed Christ as the Lord of Heaven and Earth, the sharer of the Father's throne. It is for us to extend, not to limit, His kingdom, to enlist in His service all who revere His name and obey His word, whatever their convictions concerning history and physics may be.

Let us pray that the day will come quickly when the Church will welcome to its fellowship all who adore the triumphant Christ, and that men will cease to assume a power of discrimination which belongs only to God.

BOOK REVIEWS

PROFESSOR LOISY'S 'BIRTH OF CHRISTIANITY'*

The name of Alfred Loisy must always be held in bright esteem by modernists in this country. Whatever be the differences in outlook between Continental and British modernists, the life and works of Loisy have been a constant vindication of those principles which we ourselves hold dear. Nor is his modernism the result of violent revulsion from the bondage of Catholic authority: he had openly professed and taught such views long before his ejection from the Roman Communion. For years he was suspected and openly accused of heresy: Pope Leo had declined to arraign him, but Pius X condemned his books, the worst offender being *L'Evangile et L'Eglise* in 1903. No less than five Roman decrees were aimed mainly at Loisy in 1906 and 1907, and the Encyclical *Pascendi gregis* was largely directed at the same target. In 1907 Loisy took on himself to write *Reflections on the decree Lamentabili and the encyclical Pascendi*; this procured his excommunication—possibly expected, but not desired by him, in January, 1908. He is now old in years and honour, but here he shows a mind as keen and clear as ever; it is to be hoped that this work may, before long, be made available for English readers.

Loisy's outlook, here exhibited, is, so far as I can see, just the same as that of those of us who desire to get at truth even at the cost of cherished prejudices. From these, perhaps, we can never quite free ourselves, or, if we cast them out utterly, opposite prejudices may obtrude themselves; thus it may be that Loisy goes beyond some other scholars in his conclusions about the books of the New Testament; that is a matter of degree. He is, perhaps, more doubtful than many of the accuracy of the portraiture of Jesus by the Synoptists, but he quite frankly accepts the historicity of the life of Jesus, though he sees many things in the Gospels which seem at variance with the character which the earliest writings establish. There is, to his mind, a Christian myth; yet it gathered round a real Character. But the Gospels, as we have them, 'are less the echoes of a tradition jealous to preserve intact memories concerning Jesus, than a didactic instrument of the cult of the Lord Christ.' They came into existence, one here and one there, with a catechetical object; they are described as handbooks of a liturgical drama. Hence the pre-history of Christianity has to be reconstructed—almost divined—by means of the texts which reflect it. The historical obscurity comes to an end about 180 A.D., and so does this book.

As to the historical works, Mark is dated not later than 70 A.D.; Matthew, as it stands, about 125; Luke and Acts, as they stand, must be before 140. The point of Acts, Loisy thinks, (at least an important one), is to suggest that Christianity is the best authenticated form of Judaism, and ought to be tolerated in Rome equally with Judaism. In the first part of Acts honour is given to Peter, in the second to Paul; Peter, it must be noted, is the first to preach to the Gentiles.

The discussion of the Synoptic Gospels is deeply interesting. It covers the problem of the birth at Bethlehem or Nazareth (Loisy does not speak of a Galilean Bethlehem); the relation of John's baptism to the Christian rite; the

* *La Naissance du Christianisme.* By Alfred Loisy. (Paris: Emile Nourry. 1933. 36 fr. pp. 452.)

miracles, regarded, he thinks, primitively as exorcism (Synoptics) rather than thaumaturgy (Fourth Gospel); Jesus himself not yet the Messiah, but Messiah presumptive, the reign of God not yet having come. The Sermon on the Mount is, of course, a collection of disjointed sayings, some genuine and some not. They are, however, conceived in the spirit of Jesus, 'directly penetrated by His spirit.' The detail of the trials—three in one night—are thought to be largely invented: there was a lack of reporters. The story of the crucifixion is also dramatised, in fulfilment, actual or mystical, of prophesy. Many will be surprised that Loisy regards the Paschal date of the crucifixion (Nisan XIV—given by the Fourth Gospel) as a liturgical invention, justifying this view by the early use of the passover date for commemorating the crucifixion, especially in Asia. The Marcan stories of the sepulture and the empty tomb are regarded as fictions, worked up by the other evangelists. The question of Galilee or Jerusalem as the scene of post-resurrection appearances is discussed, the Galilean being taken as original. With this it is interesting to compare Lake and Foakes-Jackson's treatment of the subject in *Beginnings*. Loisy's explanation of the resurrection appearances seems to me the least satisfactory section of the whole book; these constitute a serious problem for critical synthesis, not less important because seemingly insoluble.

The first chapters of Acts are regarded as artificial, to explain how the Church of the Spirit was substituted for the Kingdom of God. The growth of Hellenistic, as opposed to Judaistic, Christianity is most persuasively treated. Stephen is the pioneer of the one, and Peter of the other. Of course, if Christ had given directions beforehand about the admission of Gentiles there would have been no doubt in Peter's mind, and no subsequent controversy between Peter and Paul. It is pointed out how the Hellenists were persecuted but the Apostles left undisturbed (because less disturbing) at Jerusalem (Acts viii, 1). Paul is generally regarded as the hero of Hellenistic Christianity, but in fact was neither the first nor the only pioneer; Barnabas was originally Paul's chief. The story of Peter's conversion of Cornelius is thought invented, in order to indicate to readers that Peter really held the same general view as Paul. But the real pioneer of Gentile Christianity was Stephen: he announced the abolition of the non-moral rituals of Judaism; this gave a start to progressive Christian thought, and forced a complete separation from Judaism. This was not desired by Peter and the difference between him and Paul was far more acute than is represented in Acts, probably ending in an agreement to differ and to go their own ways. Paul's frequent change of companions suggest that he was not easy to get on with. The speeches in Acts Loisy regards in much the same light as Foakes-Jackson and Lake (he does not refer to the latter), as made up to suit the occasions, though sometimes they seem to be quite irrelevant. But it must be remembered that the early sermons given in Acts do represent in quite a remarkable way the simplicity of the primitive doctrine of Christianity, earlier than that of Matthew, Luke or Paul. Here again, according to our author, the redactor of Acts wants to show that Paul and his Christians were the best Jews in the world, and the true Israel.

For the rest, Loisy thinks that, after the postponement of Paul's trial, he was probably condemned and executed. The case of Peter is not clear: he was probably executed with others two years later, after the fire of Rome. The Roman Christians, Petrine and Pauline, sunk their differences near the end of the first century. Very interesting is the account of the persecutions; incidentally Loisy comes down heavily on Marcus Aurelius. Perhaps Loisy's

general attitude is best given in one sentence of this section: 'In the third century Roman paganism became the great façade behind which Christianity grew up; so in our day Christianity might become the façade behind which rises the religion of humanity.' That means the religion of Christ as opposed to traditionalism.

Speaking of the rites of the Christian mysteries, he regards the choice of Sunday for the resurrection as mythical, derived from Sun worship. Neither Baptism nor the Eucharist were instituted by Christ. Faced with the Pauline statement on the Eucharist, he thinks that this epistle, with others, has been the subject of redaction. This matter of redaction, an estimate of which must be largely conjectural, bulks largely in some of Loisy's conclusions.

Passing on to the origins of Gnosticism, Loisy points out that a mystical gnosis was really started by Paul in his Roman and later epistles; in these he transformed a Messianic faith into a theory of redemption.

Striking to many will seem the view that in the original belief Jesus became the Messiah at the Resurrection; that a secondary view grew up quite early (as expounded in Mark) that this happened at the Baptism; and that later on the event was thrown further back to the conception. To Loisy the Fourth Gospel seems to leave it all an open question; this, however, was not the considered view of Dr. Rashdall.

The chapter on the Gnostic crisis holds peculiar interest. Gnosticism starts with Simon Magus and reaches its climax in Marcion. Marcion is defended from charges of dishonesty and insincerity; it was due to him that the canon of scripture was determined in the first instance; through him also came credal definitions. His real error lay in tinkering with monotheism. The need of the Church at the time was temporary and particular: it had to fight against an intellectual and pagan syncretism. But beyond that real need 'The idea of a fixed and absolute orthodoxy,' says Loisy, 'is in flat contradiction with nature and the history of the human spirit, of human knowledge, with the history of Christianity itself.'

Loisy makes the interesting suggestion that the admission of the Fourth Gospel at Rome may date from the meeting of Polycarp with Anicetus. Its admission at Rome on a footing with the other gospels probably formed the basis of the Canon—Acts and Epistles being included at a later date (160—180 A.D.). The monarchic episcopate became general about A.D. 150—160, forming a general defence against Gnostic theories. The intellectual acrobatics of the first half of the second century were followed by the reaction of Montanism, which was a revival of a primitive illuminism—a reaction which seems to have its analogy to-day among ourselves. And at that point, where the historical fog clears up, our author leaves us.

And what is the impression left on the reader? To some, no doubt, the conclusions will seem destructive of many cherished traditions regarding Church and Bible; not so to those whose faces are set for truth, wherever it may lead. Not that all the conclusions therein suggested are necessarily true; but the truth-seeking spirit is there, and that is what counts. Our concepts of Christianity need a new orientation; such a new orientation is being diligently sought by the more thoughtful among the clergy, and by very many among the laity—women as well as men. The essence of Christianity is the belief in a God of Love, who was the God of Jesus. Loisy neither attempts nor desires to touch that.

DOUGLAS WHITE.

THE CHURCH OF ISRAEL*

This volume is sure of a hearty welcome from all the late Professor Kennett's old pupils, and there must be a considerable number of them scattered all over the world. It was a sheer delight to attend his lectures and to be carried along by his inspiring and intimate interpretation of the Old Testament.

Mr. Loewe exactly hits the nail on the head when he says: 'He not merely knew the written word, but he visualised, as few others could, the teaching of the prophets and the life and conditions of Ancient Israel.'

There must be many, too, who have to thank Professor Kennett for far more than his lectures. He so readily went out of his way to give individual help to his men and to encourage them to bring to him their personal problems. I speak as one of those who owe a very great deal to his warm and generous friendship, and who now, on seeing the excellent photograph at the beginning of this book, rise up and call him blessed.

Professor Cook republishes here six of Dr. Kennett's characteristic contributions to Biblical studies. The Professor has done well to begin with the article *Israel,* which Dr. Kennett wrote for *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1914), as 'an indispensable guide to all his writings.' Of the remaining papers I personally should choose out three as particularly welcome: the little-known essay on *Sacrifice* published in 1924 as No. 5 of the Church of England Handbooks, *The Grammar of Old Testament Study,* and *The Last Supper.*

Dr. Kennett had paid much attention to the subject of *Sacrifice,* and this brief sketch not only gives a clear exposition of the chief points necessary for an understanding of the 'vicissitudes of sacrifice' in the Old Testament, but is invaluable for the study of the significance of sacrifice in the New. A few quotations will be sufficient to indicate the line Dr. Kennett takes:

> 'The *rationale* of sacrifice is never stated in the Old Testament or even in the New . . . Although a study of anthropology and of comparative religion may throw some light on the primitive ideas which found expression in sacrifice, we cannot assume without further proof that these same ideas *continued* in later times among those who retained the rites.'
>
> 'There can . . . be no doubt as to the meaning of *Ps.* cxli, 2: "Let my prayer be set forth as incense (or rather *sacrificial smoke* . . .) . . . The psalmist means, let my prayer be accepted *instead* of sacrificial smoke.'
>
> 'To Jesus the place where a publican or a Gentile could pray, or where a boy of twelve could receive instruction in the Scriptures, was of greater importance than the place where only a Jew could sacrifice.'
>
> 'When our Saviour spoke of the Son of Man's laying down His life as a ransom for many, He was not using *sacrificial* language.'

The Grammar of Old Testament Study was a subject that Dr. Kennett had made peculiarly his own and to which he repeatedly returned. He realised the importance of a thorough understanding of Hebrew metaphor and symbolism, and as an interpreter of the Hebrew mind he excelled.

The last paper in the volume on *The Last Supper* is still not as well known as it should be. Here, briefly but with great force and conviction,

* *The Church of Israel.* Studies and Essays. By the late Robert Hatch Kennett. Edited with an Introduction by S. A. Cook. (Cambridge University Press. 12/6 net.)

Dr. Kennett sets forth his view that the idea of the Paschal Lamb lies behind the action of Christ and His actual Words of Institution.

Prefixed to this selection of Dr. Kennett's own works is a short account of his life and an estimate by Professor Cook of his contribution to Biblical Research. The estimate, as of course we should expect, is not only appreciative but also discerning and just. Few scholars have ever grasped the religious value of the Old Testament with such vividness or have been able to communicate a sense of it with such inspiration as Dr. Kennett.

On the historical side, Dr. Kennett perceived the importance of the events of the middle of the first millennium B.C. for the right understanding of the Old Testament as a whole, and 'One looks in vain,' says Professor Cook, 'in the annals of Old Testament criticism for a reconstruction of the seventh to the fifth centuries B.C. so brilliant as Kennett's.'

As to Dr. Kennett's well-known insistence upon the Maccabaean date of so large a part of what is best in Biblical literature, Professor Cook writes as follows:

> 'For myself I venture to think that Kennett has made as strong a case for the Maccabaen standpoint as can well be made. But because events of the second century B.C. could explain this prophecy or that psalm, it does not follow that the passage in question belongs to that period and is not an earlier one that applies equally to the later situation.'

But this by the way. Professor Cook and the Cambridge University Press are to be warmly and gratefully congratulated on the fitting, and indeed the admirable, tribute here paid to one of the kindest and most inspiring teachers of his generation.

J. W. HUNKIN.

RELIGION AND THE RELIGIONS*

It would be interesting to know why the ordinary churchgoer goes to church. It seems impossible not to think that a questionaire on this subject would reveal a good deal more understanding of religion, at least among English people, than Professor Leuba allows for. In this, his latest book, which condenses and brings together the results of all his previous work, he launches an irresistible attack upon 'the religions,' not, as he repeatedly says, upon 'religion.' And the ground of his attack is that the religions represent a very inadequate *method* for producing what is thought to be good. This limitation of the field of enquiry seems strange, but according to Leuba the outstanding characteristic of all the established religions is that they claim to be in possession of a method for improving the world which is distinct from, and superior to the methods of science. A sharp distinction between the works of God and the works of Man runs right through the book, and explains its title. In chapter after chapter Leuba shows how in curing disease; in control over nature; in the formation and reformation of character; in organizing world-peace; in securing satisfactory conditions of life for all men, the scientific and secular methods are superior to the religious method. What the religious method is, is explained by the following passage (p. 188):—

> 'When a church organization establishes a settlement and provides workers to teach the denizens of the slums the rudiments of housekeeping, of thrift, of cleanliness, it is not so far making use of a

* *God or Man.* A Study of the Value of God to Man. By James H. Leuba. (Kegan, Paul Trench, and Trubner, Ltd. 1934. 10/6.)

> religious method. It would be doing so only if the workers were instructed to point to faith in God and Christ, and to reliance in prayer as the means of achieving the desired transformation of individual and social habits.'

Do the majority of the supporters of the organized churches actually think that they are using a *method* in this sense? Is it a fact that, as Leuba maintains on p. 180, 'the cardinal belief of the Churches (is) in personal divine intervention'? or that (p. 20) 'the rejection of this method would mean the disappearance of every one of the organized religions'?

These are the only important matters upon which Modernists will disagree with the book. They, of course, do not see religion as one method standing separate from other methods of advancing the welfare of mankind; they see it as a pervading influence determining the direction of all the activities of life, and as a source of energy. They would not agree at all in the sharp distinction between the religious and the secular which is the object of Leuba's attack. But they are not therefore praised by him. They are, on the contrary, rated for persisting in the 'morally offensive and corrupting practice' of going through services and subscribing to beliefs which they understand in a sense quite opposed to their plain meaning; for acting 'what, to most, appears a lie'; for supporting outwardly, at any rate, 'a colossal, world-wide deception.' This is hard reading for a Modernist, because, if religion is what Leuba takes it to be, the rebuke is just. How long will Modernists put up with what appears even to a man of Leuba's understanding, a deceit? It is not enough to say that Modernist teaching is wholly against supine dependence upon God alone to do what man must do for himself, when the whole of the cult contradicts that teaching. A reading of this book ought to stir up any Modernist who thinks that the revision of the church services is a secondary matter.

Leuba has no difficulty in demonstrating in two chapters the 'Evils done by the Christian Religion.' Besides the Roman Catholic opposition to contraception and to secular studies, he gives examples from the Protestant churches. In 1918, the Board of Health of Philadelphia, in order to check the spread of a serious epidemic of influenza, asked for the suspension of religious services and other public meetings. Twenty-two clergymen of the city wrote: 'We, the undersigned clergymen . . . protest against the closing of the churches . . . We believe that such a trouble calls for renewed and redoubled public prayer and worship, and that God, our only Help in time of need, may recognise our trust in Him and send us relief. We believe that God will care for His people when, in obedience to His will, they meet to plead with Him for deliverance from evil, to confess their sins, and to go to His altar in remembrance of Christ's death and in accord with His Command.'

The exposure of the many arrogant and misleading claims made for the religious method is all the more impressive because the author, as he says over and over again, is not anti-religious. His work, he says, 'does not lead to an alternative between materialism and the spiritualistic metaphysics of the religions. What it does lead to is a choice between the primitive conception of God—the one embodied in the religions—and some other conception, in our view an anti-materialistic one also' (p. 200).

The book is so likely to be treated as an attack upon religion that it is worth while to give one or two other quotations.

> 'One may give up the social Gods of the religions and nevertheless enjoy the content and energy which a belief, however beyond proof it may be, in the ultimate triumph of the good can give' (p. 273).

> 'Science is aware of the presence of this urge, creative of knowledge, goodness and beauty; and so it may recognise, even as do the religions, that there is in the universe something mysterious, greater than the individuals' (p. 248).

With this faith, then, and the rejection of the religions as they now are, what are Leuba's positive proposals? They are contained in the last chapter on the Replacement of the Religions. The societies which are to arise from the ashes of the traditional churches will have a 'faith in the existence in the universe of a Power or a Trend which makes for goodness and beauty.' They will put much stress upon maintaining and making effective the Christian ethic; for this is a task in the author's opinion absolutely necessary to the well being of society, in the doing of which we have so far lamentably failed because we have relied upon God to do it for us. Unlike the present Ethical Societies, the New Churches will make full use of *all* means for advancing their purpose: among these means will be the employment of music and singing, of noble art and building, of the prayer-attitude, and of confession. The two conditions alone necessary 'that man may reap all the blessings ascribed to communion with God are: plasticity in relaxation, and the presence of an ideal of life equivalent to the Christian moral ideal.'

Well, this is the sort of religious community that Modernists hope to produce. Why are they not given credit for their attempt? Two reasons may be suggested. The author seems to think that the wilderness in which their voices cry is beyond any possibility of cultivation. He writes, for instance, 'the official form assumed by the modern belief' (in immortality) 'a judgment after death, paradise, hell, with or without purgatory, is familiar to everyone' (p. 81). Is this really the general belief to-day? A second reason is that he does not recognise that Modernists do want to change the present services. He writes on p. 158 that they use the official service books 'without protest.' It is a pity that the protests which actually have been made, have been made too quietly to reach even a life-long student of religion like Leuba. Unfortunately this book will not be read by those whom it would benefit most.

R. J. STANFORD.

A ROMAN PRIEST AT ENDOR*

This is a most attractive plea for reunion with Rome written by a priest of that Communion who styles himself Father Jerome. Most Anglicans will know a Roman priest like him, sane and courteous and humorous. One answer to his plea would be that Rome is not like Father Jerome, indeed so unlike that he cannot write under his own name.

> 'I am no more Father Jerome than Archangel Raphael was Azarias, son of the great Ananias, but Catholic priests, like Archangels, may sometimes find it convenient to hide their identity. This book . . . (pays) a compliment to two sets of people by irritating them both: (it tells) them they should be ideal friends instead of unsatisfactory enemies. . .'

There is about Father Jerome, as about others of his pleasant kind, a *je ne sais quoi*, what we vaguely allow for as 'Roman subtlety,' which leaves the traditional English type of mind uneasy at bottom. Father

* *A Catholic Plea for Reunion.* By Father Jerome. (Williams and Norgate, Ltd. 1934. 3/-.)

Jerome is something aware of this unfortunate impression and to that extent does his best to dispel it.

> 'The obvious objection that will come to the reader's mind is that this confession is either a grouse under the disguise of Catholic propaganda, or a bit of Catholic propaganda under the disguise of a grouse. But it is neither. It was dictated by the sole desire to be sincere both to ourselves and to Anglicans, for it is not only the Anglican who gains by his conversion, but the Catholic as well.'

He leaves no doubt that he sincerely believes the Catholic has as much to gain by reunion as the Protestant. The significance of this book is not only that it is an appeal from a Roman, but also that, in flat contradiction of the usual 'propaganda,' it pleads for reunion as chiefly necessary to save the Roman Catholic Church. Father Jerome sees Rome as a 'beleagured city' besieged by the armies of Protestantism, as an 'armed and over-disciplined camp,' suffering in nerves and temper from the perpetual alarm. Rome possesses the Truth but in her desperate defence of it has lost the humility which the gift should inspire. So she over-stresses dogma, and taking up 'a wooden attitude' towards heresy would grind converts to her own likeness and 'destroy their cherished idiosyncrasies.' 'This is not conversion, it is vandalism.' Behind the bulwarks all is not well. We note what Father Jerome reports, but satisfaction were Pharisaical when we remember the condition of our own camp, about which he is most courteously silent.

The beleagured city suffers from a surfeit of organization. The authorities 'classify, and pigeon-hole and divide into squads.' 'Men are pawns, or units or cases' and this 'to the detriment of confidence, trust, charity, truthfulness and initiative.' Also, long isolation has apparently led to a sort of religious inbreeding.

> 'It seems to be the ambition of everybody who is somebody in our beleagured city of God to perpetuate his name and memory by forcing all coming generations to say additional prayers that he or she ordered them to say on every first Friday of the month, or on every second Sunday, or every third Wednesday, or on every Monday, Tuesday or Saturday of the week, after Mass, Vespers or Benediction . . . Every Benediction nowadays is held up for an endless string of these additions: a prayer for Russia, a prayer to Our Lady, a consecration to the Sacred Heart, a prayer to St. Joseph, a litany or two. And on the lips of everyone in the congregation one can guess the faint whisper of two profane words—Dry up! But the point is that only Protestant converts in sufficient numbers could say it loud enough to be heard.'

The Orders, sometimes 25,000 men or women strong, have to be managed 'by bureaucracy, red tape and politics.'

> 'Minute division of labour disposes of the surplus numbers, one cleaning panes on the inside, and another the same panes on the outside. And they are told that such is the Will of God; it is their vocation.'
>
> 'In one order a nun's clothes weigh sixteen pounds. In another the nuns are made to wear hard boards on their chests so as to keep their busts down, as these are felt to be a danger to salvation. Their heads are encased night and day in the weirdest contraptions; skirts and petticoats are piled on by the dozen. We clergymen can never thank Protestantism adequately for forcing us to dress like sane men and discarding the extravagant *soutanes* of the Continental clergy . . .'

In Father Jerome's opinion only the help of the Anglican temper and sense of life can work the miracle of a new Reformation.

> 'Whereas the closely-knit organization of the Catholic Church has intensified all the gregarious qualities of discipline, loyalty, subjection and resignation, the loose structure of the Protestant Church has rather intensified the more individualistic qualities of initiative, freedom and independence of action, audacity in adventure, elasticity in adaptation.'

Both sides should the more realize their need of each other because their common enemies, Materialism and Atheism, are abroad and mighty. Father Jerome has practical proposals for 'Anglicans who would like to share in the benefits of our communion without losing the benefits of their own.' These he claims are in the spirit of the Malines conversations, which negotiations he seems to consider broke down because of the intransigence of the English Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Nor has Cardinal Mercier's lead been faithfully followed.

> 'There have been secret conclaves . . . in London since the Malines conversations, but the representatives sent from our side were not sincere, for in their despatches to Rome they spoke in terms different from those held before the Anglicans. Such men are not wanted.'

He proposes a 'Canterbury Patriarchate on the Marionite pattern,' the Patriarch to be elected by the English Bishops and treated by Rome *tamquam alterius orbis papam*. Roman English Sees created since 1851 would be suppressed. Anglican married clergy are a difficulty which is not insuperable nor of first importance; and Lambeth is willing to accept 'Catholic rectification of the Anglican Ministry.' The Anglican Church would retain her liturgy and ceremonial, and the two rites, Roman and Anglican, would exist side by side. 'The mere possibility of our clergy passing from one to the other would greatly improve our chiefs' manners.'

With all this so far the Modernist will feel sympathetic, and particularly with the tone of its presentation. Father Jerome is concerned to win a lost world for 'the grace of our common Redeemer,' and that urge will overrule in a Modernist's mind all prides and prejudices. The obstacle between Father Jerome and us is not one of pride. He declares himself uninterested in dogma: it is even hard to see what he means by the word, and clearly he does not realize the significance for the whole life of a Church of the dogmatic differences between Rome and Protestantism. He considers Anglicans themselves have no real interest in doctrine, and there he is perhaps sadly right if the general indifference to the recent Unitarian decision be any indication. According to Father Jerome the Reformers only used doctrinal questions as a pretext for disciplinary action and 'Protestants (have) quietly rebuilt the altars and to-day are even reinstating the Mass.' He would allow Anglicans to express their beliefs in this or that of the older Catholic formulations: they need not accept Transubstantiation, for instance, but only the belief behind it. He means to reduce the Papal claim of infallibility to one of Christ-given power to declare what is Revealed, and he fails to see that here is no reduction but merely one full statement of the dogma. Yet the price of even this divergence from present-day Rome must be abstention from criticism of Rome's further developed dogmas, on the assumption that in time the Spirit will lead Anglicans onwards to them. There's the rub. Father Jerome grows amazingly naïve. His own communion will keep its dogma; the Anglican 'must accept the steel frame of our faith.' 'Why should the old Anglicanism, with certain reservations,

not capitulate on doctrine . . . ?' The re-united Church shall have Roman dogma and the cleansing salt of Anglicanism, but in the very last chapter the cat pops out of the bag, though we do believe Father Jerome never knew the cat was there. 'After all, it is only dogma that matters; the exterior trappings may be safely left to take care of themselves.'

He is right. Dogma in fact determines what the exterior trappings shall be. Every petty abuse which Father Jerome laments in his Church could probably be shown to depend upon some elaboration of a dogma. It is the supremely important matter. Does truth ultimately lie in the Pope's infallible utterances, however defined; or in the 'deposit of Faith'; or in the Bible; or in the pronouncements of Councils and Assemblies and Convocations, or in the persons of all those who stand within the Apostolic Succession? It would appear that not only Romans but also the majority of clergymen in the Church of England to-day would select one or the other of these authorities. Or does truth lie in a man himself, instructed by the past and governed now by the conditions of his discipleship in Christ? When all is said this last, however interpreted in details, is the Protestant dogma about truth, the living out of which has produced in Anglicanism and Western civilization at large those very qualities of independence, tolerance and truthfulness which Father Jerome admires and would secure for his own communion. Anglicanism without this Protestant dogma is salt without savour, and reunion with it then would bring Father Jerome and his Church no help nor cleansing.

In Anglicanism the Protestant dogma is already dying, the savour vanishing. That is the mournful judgment unintentionally reinforced by this book from an outside observer. In asking for Anglican capitulation on dogma Father Jerome casually remarks: 'There is very little left to capitulate upon.' And, we would tell him, therefore rapidly there are coming in the English Church that same oblique regard of truth; that same devotion to policy rather than to theology; barriers of exclusion based on doctrinal formalities such as the Convocation of York has just erected; that same clericalism and over-organization; the life-denying, over-dressed Orders; the Hail Marys, the rococo worship: the whole elaborate and self-contained, religiously-sick cultus which Father Jerome despairs to find in the Roman Communion. Father Jerome summons to his aid the Anglican Church, the old judge and prophet, and he is answered by a shade. He would not be a very daring prophet who declared that in fifty years Father Jerome's brave and informative book will be on the Index of the Anglican department of the Roman Catholic Church.

M.T.D.

LIFE, POETRY, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT*

Poets have often claimed that whereas philosophers proceed by abstraction, poetry includes in its contemplation the really vital aspects of the facts which it interprets. This misunderstanding between poet and philosopher would not have needed, or survived, the publication of Professor Pringle-Pattison's *The Idea of God,* had it not been eternal and incurable in the majority of men; but some are gifted with an ability to avoid this misunderstanding, an ability clearly displayed by Professor G. Wilson Knight in *The Christian Renaissance.* His own particular method is to interpret life poetically on the ground that poetry 'reports facts fused with a proper passionate significance,' but he has no quarrel with a philosophy

* *The Christian Renaissance.* By G. Wilson Knight. (The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1933.)

which will make room for this claim: the total significance of a poem or Shakespearean drama is intuitively perceived but is capable of detailed intellectual exposition, just as a plan of campaign in a game of chess may be conceived immediately by an expert, but is worked out mediately by stages defensible in argument.

It is thus that in his first chapter on 'The Prophetic Imagination' Prof. Knight explains his method and defends it against those critics who complain that they cannot believe 'that Shakespeare can ever have intended this or that effect to be produced.' Such criticism is of course irrelevant. An essay on Symbolism follows: religious truth can seldom be housed in direct statement and the highest literary creation is essentially incarnation.

Prof. Knight then proceeds, after illustrating his thesis by an examination of the art-form in Shakespeare, to a discussion of the New Testament as an art-form. The core of this chapter can be put in Prof. Knight's own words: '. . . to a final judgment, creative living is on a higher plane than creative art . . .' and 'Jesus, as a person, corresponds to the art-form of the poet. He is in himself the incarnation the poet accomplishes in art. He creates in his imagination his own poetry, and then acts it, making himself protagonist in his own drama' (pp. 67 and 74). This is excellently put, but Prof. Knight is not so convincing when he discusses the New Testament as a whole. He would perhaps have been clearer if he had taken parts of the New Testament separately, *e.g.* Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and the Johannine literature. This consideration tends to modify at least verbally the claim in Chapter V that we must see the New Testament as a perfect whole and must not ask whether any part is history or direct symbolism, on the ground that 'the book finally transcends these categories of poetry and history' (p. 106).

In Part II (Poetic Interpretations), Chapter VI (The Poet's Paradise) is a study of different poets' portrayals of the 'life-consciousness' and 'death-consciousness.' The former at its height is the paradisal vision whence the latter is excluded. Eschatological imagery is essentially, like this poetry, interpretation of immediate life-experience. This is illustrated by a detailed study of Dante, Goethe, and Shakespeare. The two essays on the New Testament which follow, one on St. Paul (Mankind in Glory) and one on the Gospels (The Pioneer of Life), emphasize the contrast between the light and life shown forth by the protagonists in the New Testament and the darkness and death of the world they seek to transform. Paul's message is the new life which he embodies; and we see Jesus 'silhouetted against a world of formalized religion, hypocrisy, envy, evil, and suffering' (p. 240). The last four chapters of the book, constituting 'Part III, Prophecy'—wherein true immortality is equated with life (a term usually wrongly reserved for the fragment of it between a man's birth and death)—seek to apply the results of the previous chapters to the twentieth century. This task calls forth a passionate appeal for a more whole-hearted understanding of the 'new life' from which Christianity cannot be separated. Such understanding will see this life as including and transcending rather than selecting from the natural life of man. Hence Prof. Knight does not hesitate to call the raw material in the spirit of man by the name of Eros, including in the term far more than man's sexual nature, but pleading that all its manifestations are worthy of sanctification into the religious life. 'It is still possible to think that the erotic theme of a cinematograph romance has nothing whatever to do with Christianity. I ask then that Christianity sanctify the Eros and all great art at least, allowing this to be, at its best, included within the Third Person of its Trinity' (p. 336). The New Testa-

ment, we are reminded, calls us to a super-sexual, not unsexual life. Thus D. H. Lawrence is a true prophet, but 'we need to understand him better than he understood Christianity.' St. Paul's own moderate counsel to celibacy may have proceeded from a distrust not of the holiness of marriage but of the general misunderstanding of it which he knew existed. Our task is to clear away this misunderstanding rather than to legislate on the basis of it.

We are perhaps familiar with preachers who seek to rouse us to 'a new life in Christ.' What is unfamiliar in Prof. Knight's most provocative and often brilliantly written book is the diagnosis of the reason for our failure to respond to these exhortations: the Church is shy of Eros and hence 'the Holy Spirit . . . the Giver of Life' has become an empty formula in her creed. Prof. Knight's clear perception shows that he has the right to demand of our worship, as he does in his last chapter, 'Is this the radiant poetry of life, the freedom from the Law . . . announced by St. Paul? Where is the living water promised by Jesus? Where, to-day, the resurrected and triumphant Christ?' (p. 358). Prof. Knight has done something to help us answer these questions and has been ingenious enough to suggest a formula by which a modern Christian, while insisting that his private judgment must be his final authority, may yet regard himself as a true member of the traditional Church: he need not accept the whole theology of Paul or even of Jesus, but he must believe in their beliefs.

A. R. C. Leaney.

THINKERS ALL*

The Thinker's Library gives extraordinary good value for the money. The volumes are very well printed, neatly bound, and cost one shilling each. With very few exceptions they are reprints, and all are interesting. It must be admitted, however, that they are a very mixed grill. We have *Education* by Herbert Spencer, one of the very best things that 'the most unending ass in Christendom,' as Thomas Carlyle dubbed him, ever wrote. Then we have *Penguin Island* and *The Revolt of the Angels* by that exquisite decadent Anatole France. Then we have Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* and Lord Morley's essay on *Compromise*. Then we have *Penalties upon Opinion* by Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner, one who certainly ought to know, as she was the daughter of that great protagonist for freedom of thought, Charles Bradlaugh; and with this may be very appropriately bracketed *Lectures and Essays* of T. H. Huxley. Then we have *Head Hunters: Black, White and Brown* by Dr. Haddon and *Twelve Years in a Monastery* by Joseph McCabe. Then we have that really brilliant volume, *An Agnostic's Apology,* by Sir Leslie Stephen, and *Our New Religion*—a criticism of Christian Science—by his distinguished nephew, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher. Then we have *The Evolution of the Idea of God* by Grant Allen, and *The City of Dreadful Night* by James Thompson, Buckle's *History of Civilization,* and *A Short History of the World* by Mr. H. G. Wells. Then we have the greatest of John Stuart Mill's essays, *On Liberty,* and the much criticised *The Riddle of the Universe* by Ernst Haeckel. Our most modern of Sciences—anthropology—is represented by Sir Edward Tylor's *Anthropology*, Prof. Elliot Smith's *In the Beginning*, and Sir G. G. Frazer's *Adonis*.

There are many other volumes, but those named will indicate the wide range and generally high quality of The Thinker's Library.

* *The Thinker's Library.* (C. A. Watts and Co., London. 1/- each.)

It is not difficult, as one scrutinizes the selection, to discover the principle which underlies it. The reader, if he learns his lesson properly, will derive from their perusal a contempt, an intellectual contempt, for all traditional beliefs.

'I take possession of man's mind and deed,
I care not what the sects may brawl.
I sit as God holding no form of creed,
But contemplating all . . .'

will represent the reader's elevated, if somewhat insecure, position as he lays down the volumes one by one.

Young men and young women would do well to read many of these volumes: as educated persons they ought to be acquainted with them: but we are not sure that their loss might be greater than their gain if, as the result of reading them, they come to the conclusion that the proper goal of Rationalism is Agnosticism or Atheism, and not Theism. Although a number of these volumes have laid the foundations for much of our modern thinking, they are—and it is quite natural that they should be, in view of the progressive character of modern life—a little out of date. The reader of The Thinker's Library is thinking with some of the best minds of the recent past, but not with some of the greatest minds that have ever existed, nor with the best modern. He should know these volumes of The Thinker's Library, but there are volumes written before them and volumes written since them which it is even more important for him to know.

H.D.A.M.

FOR SCHOOL USE*

Two school text-books recently published are intended to fill the need, now becoming more generally recognised, for taking a wider view of Scripture than was sometimes done in the past. One of them covers the Old Testament and Apocrypha; the other, a conspectus of the four Gospels, is the first part of a two-volume 'New Testament History,' of which the second is to cover the ground of Acts, with the story of the life and growth of the early Church.

Mr. Toyne's book is on the whole well produced. It is especially good to have, in a concise form, matter for some lessons on the Apocrypha. If we are justified in teaching the history of the Jewish peoples to Christians, we are not justified in finishing, as we do so often, with the Canon; the development of religious ideas did not then finish. With this book and, perhaps, the 'World's Classics' edition of the Apocrypha something may be done to remedy the defect.

It may be inevitable in a work of small compass, but it is always dangerous to treat theories as if they were established facts. J, E, P and D, for example, are theories rather than facts. There ought to be room even in such a book to explain the difference. It was probably unwise to use the Authorized Version entirely for quotations, and the lure of the easy generalization sometimes proves too great. We doubt whether suggested questions such as 'Enumerate the first five stages in Hebrew religion,' or 'Estimate the spiritual value of the Psalms,' are of much use, though others are wisely phrased and provocative of the right amount of thought. Passages for reading, from the Old Testament and Apocrypha, are gener-

* *The Old Testament and the Apocrypha.* By A. C. Toyne, M.A. (Edward Arnold and Co. 1933. Price 3/-.)
New Testament History. Volume I. By Stanley Wood, M.A. (George Gill and Sons, Ltd. 1933. Price 3/6.)

ally well chosen, and the summaries of the work and careers of individuals are good. One or two words read strangely: in particular 'baalish' and 'baalism' (sometimes with, sometimes without, the capital B).

The problem of 'compressing into a few hundred pages a Life of Christ as portrayed in the Gospels, together with a commentary on His teaching and an outline of contemporary events . . .' is a serious one. It might even be suspected that Mr. Wood's object was, more vulgarly, that of providing a 'cram-book' to secure a 'credit' for its student in School Certificate New Testament: a material purpose not disguised by the author's having abandoned the use of the Gospel texts in favour of a reconstruction conflating all four. Here is a not wholly unfair specimen: 'The old law of adultery is to be spiritually extended. If the sensual nature is weak, strong measures of self-discipline must be adopted, even to the plucking-out of the eye or the cutting-off of the hand.' The book abounds in assumptions, which may be true or contain some truth, but cannot be left undiscussed. 'The Fourth Gospel differs widely from the other three. In the first place it is an original composition, not a compilation' (p. 5). 'Matthew and Luke are Greek translations from Aramaic' (p. 6). 'We have already seen that the birth of Christ was in fulfilment of prophecy' (p. 37). 'The Gospel of St. Mark gives the general view of the Christ: that by St. Matthew the Jewish, that by St. Luke the Gentile and that by St. John the Church's view.' Some surprising statements are made. The Roman Army 'was composed of 25 legions and 25 auxiliaries' (p. 8); 'Jewish colonies' (p. 50) appears to mean Jewish settlements outside Palestine; and 'Judas Maccabee' is a careless form of the name. Incidents such as the Transfiguration are treated with a literalness and a certainty which most would find difficult. There seems to be little value in a note on the arrangement of the priestly courses, which merely states that the arrangement was made by David; nor in one on 'Abraham's bosom,' which explains it as 'reclining next to Abraham at the celestial banquet. Jesus' figurative language.' References to authorities jotted down at the foot of a page merely as 'Gibbon' or 'Seeley' or 'New Commentary' are also of little value. The mere name will mean nothing to a schoolboy, and anyone else will want a precise reference to the title of the work, and the page, as well as to the author's name.

The numerous illustrations are well chosen and well reproduced.

W. H. OLDAKER.

CORRESPONDENCE

DE PROFUNDIS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

Has not the Upper House of the Convocation of York placed a perhaps insurmountable stumbling-block in the path?

The 'Very God' formula may in its time have been the truest expression of Christian experience. I am not a theologian, historian or philosopher enough to judge. In the light of modern knowledge and psychology, it seems to many of us inadequate and misleading. Yet we are told it is to be for all time the shibboleth of the Christian Faith.

But that is not the most serious aspect of the situation. Jesus said: Not everyone who crieth Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of the

Father. The York Bishops have authoritatively decided that the 'Lord, Lord' test is the true one for members of the Church of England to apply.

May I, without flattery, thank you for the splendid lead you and the Modernist leaders in general are giving in your message of 'Comprehensiveness' as one of the dominent keynotes of the Church of England?

Without being tragic, may I say that the 'traditionalist,' pseudo-Catholic attitude of those who speak in formal authority is shaking our loyalty to its foundations?

ARTHUR DAVIES.

Ivy Gates, Berkhamsted, Herts.
June 10th, 1934.

SIR,

AMERICAN MODERNISM.

Permit me as a subscriber outside the pale of Anglican Modernism but in hearty accord with the spirit and purpose of your excellent magazine to voice my astonishment at the appearance of an editorial comment in the correspondence department of the June issue.

Following an extraordinarily intemperate letter from India in which the writer 'drops a brick or two' on the article in the May number entitled 'Catholicism and Modernism: an American View,' you call attention to the sub-title and add: 'We felt that the article would interest our readers by indicating that American Modernism is more akin to Continental Modernism. We hold no brief for American Modernism.'

Is it possible that you expected your well-informed readers to accept that article's fantastic effort to mingle the oil of medievalism with the water of liberalism as a fair example of the modern movement of religious thought in America? It would indeed be interesting to know who devised the sub-title, 'An American View,' Professor Pittenger or the Editor of the *Modern Churchman*. If the former, the writer took much upon himself. If the latter, some further explanation might be in order.

Your subscriber's ministry for thirty years was spent in the Modernist camp in America. For ten of those years he had the opportunity of close contacts with representatives of all the larger Christian communions in every part of the country. Never during all those years did he ever happen to meet anything approaching the peculiar type of thinking you are pleased to accept as the Simon pure American Modernism.

The author of the article in question is evidently a widely-read and learned Churchman. He knows his Latin and is at home among the Church Fathers. This of course would not disqualify him as an interpreter of Modernism. But his extreme Anglo-Catholicism certainly would. The *Modern Churchman* does not usually drink at such a fount for its refreshment. Why seek it for 'the American View'?

Moreover, one wonders by what process of reasoning the *Modern Churchman* arrives at the conclusion that the American brand of Modernism resembles the Continental more closely than it does the English. Such a wide generalization simply clamours for explication. What are these similarities and differences? If such distinctions, based upon geographical lines, are observable, here is fine material for a noteworthy article.

The Modernists' outlook upon the world of to-day consists of the spirit of free inquiry, the frank facing of fresh revelations of truth from every quarter and a passion to discover God at His work in a living universe. This quest has no national or continental boundaries. It holds no brief for insularity. It presents a united front. This is the message so eloquently expressed by Dr. Bethune-Baker in your June number:

'Our fold has shown itself to be one with expanding walls. And it is the peculiar concern of Modern Churchmen of all generations, and of all schools, to see to it that the walls never close in on them.'

Barbizon, France. JOSEPH W. COCHRAN.
June 27th, 1934.

[Our correspondent's query touches us nearly. The Editor, unless his memory betrays him, was responsible for the sub-title of the article. We were tempted to write 'American Catholic Modernism,' but felt that might mislead. 'American Anglo-Catholic Modernism' might have seemed a contradiction in terms, so, following the critical *dictum* that the shorter variant is to be preferred to the longer, we wrote 'an American View.' We have reason to believe that Professor Pittenger does represent a school in America, and we shall hope at no distant date to deal with it more fully.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

A PROTEST.

May a humble, and no doubt ignorant, country parson utter his protest against the bitter and un-Christian tone of Mr. Bristow's letter in your issue of this month? Surely we do not want the methods of 'business men' introduced into so tolerant a movement as that which is directed by your friendly pen. Our Evangelical and Catholic brethren may not be perfect, but may it not be our duty as Christians to consider the beam in our own eye before we trouble about the mote in our brothers'?

Burlescombe Vicarage, Taunton, Somerset. BASIL BUCHANAN.
June 20th, 1934.

SIR,

CHURCH UNITY.

In connexion with the Manifesto to the Free Churches which was recently issued in *The Times*, a booklet (32 pp.) has been published by the Union, in collaboration with the A.E.G.M., entitled *The Church of England and the Free Churches—The Road to Reunion*. This can be obtained from the office of the Union price 3*d*., or 2*s*. 0*d*. per dozen, post free. It contains the following articles:—

The Historic Position of the Church of England. By Archdeacon Hunkin.
The English Bishops and Intercommunion. By Archdeacon Hunkin.
The South India Unity Scheme. By Bishop Norman Tubbs.
The Road to Reunion. By Canon Guy Rogers.

Members would help the cause of reunion by purchasing copies of this booklet and distributing them, especially among their Free Church friends. Copies of the Manifesto can also be obtained, 6*d*. per dozen, post free.

The Church House, T. J. WOOD.
Westminster,
London, S.W.1.
July 6th, 1934.